

# **NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION**

**Quarterly**

Quality Education for All  
Opinions About North Central Association  
Accreditation of Junior High Schools  
Pros and Cons of External Testing  
Studies on In-Service Education of  
College Instructors  
Treasurer's Report for the Fiscal Year  
Publications of the Association  
Twenty-seventh Annual Meeting  
March 26-30, 1962

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS  
LIBRARY

OCT 11 1961

CHICAGO

Theme: "The Role of the North Central Association:  
Improving Education Through the  
Accreditation Process"

**VOLUME XXXVI**

**FALL, 1961**

**NUMBER 2**

**Committee  
on  
Publications**

**ROBERT J. KELLER** Minneapolis, Minnesota  
*Chairman*  
**EDWARD VONDER HAAR** Cincinnati, Ohio  
**OTIS A. CROSBY** Detroit, Michigan  
**NORMAN BURNS** Chicago, Illinois  
**ALVA J. GIBSON** Charleston, West Virginia  
**HERBERT W. SCHOOLING** Webster Groves, Missouri  
**R. NELSON SNIDER** Fort Wayne, Indiana

**EDITORS**

**NORMAN BURNS**

*Editor*

**ANNE STAMESHKIN**

*Associate Editor*

**Official Organ  
of the  
North Central Association  
of Colleges  
and Secondary Schools**

THE NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION QUARTERLY is published by the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools in Summer, Fall, Winter, and Spring. It is the official organ of the Association, and contains the proceedings of the annual meeting of the Association, together with much additional material directly related to the work of the Association. The regular subscription price is \$4.00 a year. The July number is priced at \$1.75; the others, \$1.00 each. All members of the Association—institutional and individual—are entitled to receive the QUARTERLY as part of their annual fees. A special subscription price of \$3.00 per year is permitted to school libraries, college libraries, and public libraries and to individuals connected with North Central Association membership institutions. Subscription orders may be sent to the Executive and Editorial Office.

PUBLICATION OFFICE: George Banta Company, Inc., Menasha, Wisconsin.

EDITORIAL OFFICE: 5454 South Shore Drive, Chicago 15, Illinois.

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

SECOND CLASS postage paid at Menasha, Wisconsin. Acceptance for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized March 8, 1919.



# The

## NORTH CENTRAL

## ASSOCIATION

## Quarterly

ASSOCIATION NOTES AND EDITORIAL COMMENT . . . 163

### CONTENTS

	Quality in Education—STS Project Continues—NCA Has New Address—NCA Continues Study of External Testing—Know Your North Central—1962 Annual Meeting Shortened—Review Program Policy Revised—TV Committee Plans Dissemination Conferences	
FOR	THE MEANING OF QUALITY IN EDUCATION . A Symposium. <i>Stephen A. Romine, Robert H. Beck, Mrs. Rollin Brown, Harold L. Clapp, Benjamin C. Willis</i>	167
FALL	PRODUCING QUALITY EDUCATION FOR ALL . . . . . <i>Val H. Wilson</i>	175
1961	PRODUCING QUALITY EDUCATION FOR SECONDARY SCHOOLS . . . . . <i>Kenneth Oberholtzer</i>	182
	QUALITY EDUCATION FOR ALL . . . . . <i>Conrad Bergendoff</i>	186
VOLUME XXXVI	OPINIONS ABOUT NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION ACCREDITATION OF JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS . . . . . <i>Stephen A. Romine</i>	193
Number 2	PROS AND CONS OF EXTERNAL TESTING PROGRAMS . . . . . <i>Frank B. Womer</i>	201
	TWO STUDIES ON IN-SERVICE EDUCATION OF COLLEGE INSTRUCTORS	
	I. ORIENTING NEW FACULTY MEMBERS IN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES . . . . . <i>Norbert J. Tracy, S.J.</i>	214
	II. PROBLEMS OF NEW FACULTY MEMBERS IN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES . . . . . <i>Harlan R. McCall</i>	222
	TREASURER'S REPORT FOR THE FISCAL YEAR, JULY 1, 1960—JUNE 30, 1961 . . . . . <i>R. Nelson Snider</i>	235
	PUBLICATIONS OF THE NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION .	241



**The  
NORTH CENTRAL  
ASSOCIATION  
Quarterly**

**Fall 1961**

VOLUME XXXVI, NUMBER 2

---

**Association Notes and Editorial Comment**

---

**QUALITY IN EDUCATION**

THIS ISSUE of the QUARTERLY is given largely to discussion of quality in education, the topic of the 1961 Annual Meeting of the North Central Association. The papers presented at the meeting and published here come to grips with various aspects of the subject and present differing points of view. They represent the views of men who, as outstanding members of the educational profession, have much to contribute to our understanding of this topic.

The subject of quality in education is of basic significance to all of us, educators and non-educators alike, since the quality of our education is the prime determinant of the quality of our living. The baffling thing about quality in education is that it has no single, clear, and generally acceptable definition for it is rooted in and is, in turn, a determinant of our system of values. And values have meaning only as we, as individuals and as a society, give them meaning.

Even a totalitarian society cannot prescribe a value system to which all its members will fully subscribe although it may try to do so. Such a society can, however, impose a large measure of conformity in these matters through the imposition of an educational pattern in which a priority of goals is established and means for achieving these objectives are deter-

mined by the top echelon of the ruling group.

In a society based on individual freedom of choice, the only mechanism through which agreement on values, on educational goals, and the means for achieving them can be approached is continuing conversation in which the various points of view regarding means and ends are presented and discussed. Through continuing conversation some measure of agreement is possible. But perhaps the more important outcome is the growth of mutual understanding of the disparity of views which finds expression in the wide diversity of institutional forms through which the educational process is carried on.

With greater understanding comes tolerance of and respect for views other than our own, and recognition that the resulting diversity among educational institutions is a strength rather than a weakness since it provides the means for serving the manifold educational needs of a complex society.

NORMAN BURNS

**STS PROJECT CONTINUES**

THE NCA-STS Project, which was formulated in 1957 and launched in 1958, is continuing its progress toward completion of its major purposes. With the expiration of the grant from the Carnegie Corpora-



### NCA HAS NEW ADDRESS

5454 South Shore Drive, Chicago 15, Illinois, is the new address of the Secretary of the North Central Association, the Commission on Colleges and Universities, and the editorial offices of the *QUARTERLY*, *NCA Today*, and other North Central publications.

Also housed in the recently-occupied office is the NCA Project on Guidance and Motivation of Superior and Talented Students (STS Project).

tion of New York, the STS staff disbanded as of August 31, 1961; however, the on-going program is moving ahead under the leadership of the NCA-STS Committee and the Liaison Committees of the cooperating regional associations.

The Committee has called upon the Project schools to build upon the foundations laid during the past three years and to "continue your present interest and activities at the highest possible level. The outcomes of the next two years can result in the most significant contributions of this five-year plan."

Publications developed and issued by the STS Project (see page 242 of this issue) can be ordered from Secretary, North Central Association, 5454 South Shore Drive, Chicago 15, Illinois. The most recent of these publications is June Sochen's "A Resume of Selected Research on Superior and Talented High School Students" (50¢ each). This brief booklet is designed to acquaint school personnel with relevant research in the characteristics, identification, motivation, and guidance of superior and talented students. The last chapter deals with administrative provisions for establishing and improving STS programs.

Scheduled for future publication is a booklet tentatively entitled, "Building Programs for Superior and Talented

High School Students," which will draw upon successfully used procedures and principles emerging from the Project.

### NCA CONTINUES STUDY OF EXTERNAL TESTING

THE NCA Committee on Articulation of High Schools and Colleges is continuing its efforts to reduce the problems of external testing. The work and progress of the Committee is summarized in the Second Report on External Testing (Special Issue, *NCA Today*, August, 1961, which is being enthusiastically received by educators within and outside the NCA territory.

The Report, hailed by a California administrator as the "most definitive and probing document yet published about this problem" is experiencing wide distribution throughout the United States.

Copies of the Second Report, as well as a limited supply of the preceding First Report (Special Issue, *NCA Today*, December, 1960) are available, without charge, from Secretary, North Central Association, 5454 South Shore Drive, Chicago 15, Illinois.

A valuable supplement on testing appears in this issue of the *QUARTERLY*. Reports of Dr. Frank B. Womer's penetrating analysis, "Pros and Cons of External Testing," (25¢ per copy) can also be obtained from the NCA Secretary's office.

### KNOW YOUR NORTH CENTRAL

JUST OFF THE PRESS is a colorful, abbreviated revision of *KNOW YOUR NORTH CENTRAL*. This leaflet succinctly describes the purposes, membership, administration, publications, and programs of the Association. It is particularly designed to give to educators and interested laymen a better understanding of North Central's activities.

Copies of this light-weight publication, which fits easily into a standard #10 envelope, are available without charge from the Secretary, North Central Association, 5454 South Shore Drive, Chicago 15, Illinois.



### 1962 ANNUAL MEETING SHORTENED

THE 1962 Annual Meeting "Week" will be telescoped into three days, Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday. While various committee and accrediting sessions are scheduled for Sunday and Monday, March 25 and March 26, the general sessions and open meetings of the three commissions are planned for March 27 through March 29. The conference will adjourn Thursday afternoon; however, the NCA Executive Committee will meet on Friday, March 30.

"The Role of the North Central Association: Improving Education Through the Accreditation Process" has been selected as the overall theme for the conference. General Sessions, Commission meetings, and group conferences will re-examine and re-interpret the work of the Association and the contribution of the accreditation process to American education.

Program details will be outlined in future issues of *NCA Today* and the *QUARTERLY*. Annual Meeting materials will reach NCA member institutions about February 10, 1962.

### REVIEW PROGRAM POLICY REVISED

THE EXECUTIVE BOARD of the NCA Commission on Colleges and Universities, at its meeting on June 23, 1961, voted to adopt the recommendations of the Committee on the Reappraisal of the Review Program. These recommendations now become the policy of the revised review program and can be summarized as follows:

The review program is to have a single purpose—the assessment of the present quality of the institution. In other words, the review visit is to be a reexamination visit patterned on the regular accrediting visit.

During the year of 1962 the revised approach to the review program is to be tried out in a very small group of institutions drawn from the different types

within the various degree levels—junior college, Bachelor's, Master's, and Doctor's. The personnel of the review teams for this group of institutions are to receive no honorarium for their services. The expenses incurred by the members of the team are to be paid by the institutions being reviewed.

After the Annual Meeting of 1963 the results of the first year of the revised program will be evaluated. The findings of this evaluation will be used not only to strengthen and perfect the review program but also to develop a training program for people who will be members of future review teams.

### TV COMMITTEE PLANS DISSEMINATION CONFERENCES

THE NCA Subcommittee on Television announces receipt of an additional grant of \$45,000 from the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, designated for dissemination conferences on the uses of television in education.

Accordingly, conferences are being planned for various sections of the NCA region. Materials and programs for these conferences will be based upon the recommendations emanating from the NCA Seminar on the Uses of Television in Education, held in Chicago in December, 1959 and the NCA Pilot Conference on the Dissemination of Principles and Practices in the Uses of Television in Education.

Participants in the Seminar and Pilot Conference recommended that individual state dissemination conferences be held in West Virginia, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, and Ohio; that a regional Midwest Six-State Conference cover North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Nebraska; that a regional South Central Four-State Conference include Arkansas, Oklahoma, Missouri, and Kansas; and that a Southwestern States Regional Conference be comprised of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, and Wyoming.

In scheduling and planning these various conferences, the NCA Subcommittee on Television is working through NCA State Chairmen and representatives of NCA colleges and universities in the specified areas.

Every conference will have official representation from the other regional accrediting associations. Representatives from these agencies have been and will be

active participants in the planning of the conferences, the conference meetings, and the post-conference sessions held for the purpose of evaluation and report.

\* The NCA Subcommittee plans to have the dissemination conferences completed so that a comprehensive report can be made to the Association at the 1962 Annual Meeting.



# The Meaning of Quality in Education\*

## A Symposium

---

**MODERATOR:** STEPHEN A. ROMINE, Dean, School of Education, University of Colorado, Boulder; then President of the North Central Association

**PARTICIPANTS:** ROBERT H. BECK, Professor of History and Philosophy of Education, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis

MRS. ROLLIN BROWN, Immediate Past President of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, Los Angeles, California

HAROLD L. CLAPP, Professor of Modern Languages, Grinnell College, Grinnell, Iowa; Chairman of the Board, Council for Basic Education

BENJAMIN C. WILLIS, Superintendent of Public Schools, Chicago, Illinois; President, American Association of School Administrators

**DR. ROMINE:** The theme of this Sixty-sixth Annual Meeting is "Quality Education For All." Such a theme may have many meanings. The purpose of this First General Session, therefore, is to define quality education—to set forth some of its major dimensions. To attempt this formidable task we have decided to use the method of the symposium. My role this evening is that of moderator.

The fundamental reason for using the symposium approach this evening is to present varying points of view in a lively and provocative as well as enlightening manner; for although our topic is serious, it need not be deadly. This method also helps us to escape the insidious danger of hearing only what we already believe, of talking exclusively to ourselves, thereby strengthening existing biases without causing us sufficiently to question and to verify our views. The approach permits us also to hear, on a single occasion, differing as well as familiar points of view which may stimulate us to derive a sounder position than any that has yet been voiced.

One of our failings, it seems to me, in this modern era is the tendency to put faith and trust in half-truths, to treat them as whole truths, consequently deluding ourselves and misleading others. I

would suggest without criticism that both the proponents and the opponents of American education, as each group conceives it to be, frequently suffers from this disease. We all seem to long for certitude, often lacking comprehension but rarely conviction.

It is our hope, in presenting tonight persons who have come to certain reasoned positions which differ one from the other, that we shall get out all of the facts, all of the opinions, and all of the feelings before any of us begins to make pronouncements or to arrive at conclusions.

**DR. BECK:** I question the use of our title, "Quality Education," unless we assume (and we do) that we are speaking of a superior quality. The word must be conditioned. I assume, too, that you would not wish to rest on your laurels and have me suggest to you that all is well with what we are doing—that we have arrived at the quality you would wish. This you know is not true.

To me, a superior education is one that strengthens the student's ability and desire to push on. It is not a mastery; it is not a summing up. I wish to think of it, then, in these terms.

I think a superior education must look to the future; that it must be cognizant that those who guide it—since education is not of itself—must be constantly aware of what future demands certainly will be or might be.

\* An abridged version of a symposium presented at the First General Session of the 1961 Annual Meeting of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, held in Chicago Illinois, March 21, 1961.—EDITOR



I cannot think of a superior education today—and we are thinking of it at the secondary school level—that is not aware of the fact that the young people who will be citizens will have to be sensitive to, accepting of, and able to exploit a very impressive range of differences in the world, very grave alternatives to that with which they are familiar; that they will have to be responsible human beings; that, thinking of their political role and thinking of the economic demands that will be made for political wisdom, they will have to be prepared to think in quite sophisticated terms if they are not to abrogate their citizenship.

Therefore, I would say straightaway, speaking of fields of study, that a superior education certainly must include, in terms of subjects, the social studies by which I mean more than history and most certainly more than political history, which has been the regnant history of our schools. For our schools have not included the history of art, religion, science, or ideas. I mean more than history; I mean sociology, cultural anthropology, and political science which includes the study of political behavior, political theories, and the study of ideas that will be changing political thought.

I think attitudes will not be guaranteed, but they will be fortified by the social studies—attitudes of humaneness, of compassion, of concern, of care for people.

We cannot saddle a school with everything—I am not forgetting other agencies and institutions, as well as home and church—but the school itself must feel, and its leaders must feel, obligated to increase the desire and ability of young people to be concerned with themselves for their own enhancement and with others—others far away and very different.

I believe we must continue to have (and where it is not present, we must have) vocational education—vocational and technical education. We must have education that is pre-engineering in its technical phases—and education that is far more terminal than vocational educa-

tion. This belongs with the school but must not be thought of as excusing a student from the privilege of general studies—general studies which are not thought of as the same substance for all students.

How to variegate the general studies is a very great challenge. Education, if it is superior, must attend to the expression of students as individuals. I think as a people we have not done remarkably well with permitting ourselves a personal idiom, some stamp of ourselves on our environment. This is why we have so much telling talk of conformity. A superior education will not be swallowed up even in the discipline of mind, but will attempt in some genuine action to quicken the spirit, to permit students to reflect upon themselves, and to develop a greater sensitivity of values.

While all of you were born teachers, many of us were not so born—we had to be prepared. I feel that our preparation—our professional preparation and our subject matter fields—has been wanting not because it has not been sufficient but because it has not been very imaginative. We must have a greater indulgence on the part of my colleagues or professors in working with secondary school teachers and principals and superintendents in the refinement of subject matters.

I turn to research which I feel undergirds pedagogy. We are pedagogues; we are educationists; we must have some techniques; our techniques must be viable and they must be subject to review. We must be able to do research and we must be able to understand research if we are to review what we do.

I cannot believe we can have superior education if our teachers are unable to read and assess research literature in psychology, in the behavioral sciences. I cannot believe we can have superior teaching if our teachers and those who work with them are not oriented to doing experimental studies on education and in evaluation of education. We must not simply say, "Now we have a superior program here is what we teach," and have all the honored names without having evaluation



and constant review as a part of our design.

Let me close with this: I believe that there is point to saying that we are attempting to develop the personality of students. There is no reason why that phrase should have become something that is anticollectual, clearly apart from learning. I cannot believe it. What learning? Whose learning? Learning what made what difference in what sort of context? To what ends? Forgetting the world in which students must live?

I see nothing wrong either in a secondary education which intends to improve the physical development of students. Quite apart from the often spoken of physical fitness, the mind, too, is thus being educated. Far too many of our people have no pleasure in themselves physically—are not alive, are what Cummings refers to as “undead.”

We must have education that stresses civic responsibility. Responsibility is learned, and it isn't easy. It must be taught. It must be taught in a variety of contexts, and unless it is demanded of students that they be responsible in sharing for the planning of their own course of study, that they be responsible in student government, that they be encouraged in a great variety of ways, I do not think civic responsibility will result.

MRS. BROWN: Not very long ago I heard a distinguished American comment that Henry Cabot's statement that “Love, work and worship are the motivating forces in the life of man” sounds “corny” to many people today. Why should it?

This reminded me of something H. A. Murray wrote a good many years ago about our modern attitude toward morality—morality in the broad sense, that involves the inner core of man's being and his concept of himself and his relation to other men. Murray pointed out that this country was founded by political and religious nonconformists and that we hadn't ever got over it, for we still talked about freedom from this and freedom from that, hiding behind these protective guar-

antees instead of accepting our freedom as our hard-won liberty to do and be something positive and worthwhile. This surely involves the highest and best development and use of our individual gifts and our total potential for constructive living.

I believe that some of our current alarmists would do well to read again the 25th Chapter of St. Matthew and study the parable of the talents. The servant with many talents was expected to use and multiply them. St. Luke put it this way in Chapter 12, verse 48: “For unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall much be required.”

It is also very clear that the man with the least was expected to make good use of his trust, too. The same lesson is carried in Paul's first epistle to the Corinthians, not the 13th chapter that speaks so eloquently of love and faith and hope, but in the 12th chapter in which the apostle gives every indication that today he would be quite at home in psychosomatic medicine. The whole idea is summed up in the 14th verse: “For the body is not one member, but many.”

Of course we do not all progress in identical ways; but, as Paul said, “If the whole body were an eye, where were the hearing?”

I mention these eminently respectable sources because of the frantic effort of some human termites who profess to see something un-American or subversive in the modern school's emphasis upon meeting the needs of individual children—all of them—gifted, average, slow, handicapped—all of them.

The Greeks had a word for it, too. Above the door of the palaestra or gymnasiums were carved the words, “Strip or Retire.” Every Greek boy understood what this meant. No one put him out; but he knew that he was to get in the game, be a participant, or leave, and that he was not expected to leave. Based on this philosophy of life, Greece gave the world the Golden Era. Expose yourself to new challenges. Be a creator through service.

It is perfectly clear that if we are to survive in this world of atoms, automa-

tion, fusion and fission, we must maintain all of our vital community services at an efficient level. We must be concerned with science and technology, but we cannot neglect the social, economic, political, moral and spiritual development of our people.

So the great debate goes on. As our communities undertake a continuing examination of the aims, the organization, the staffing and financing of our schools, we expect from professional educators the help we need to increase our competence in analyzing and thinking about educational problems, in evolving possible solutions, in reality-testing.

Meantime, it is evident that we are not going to abandon the comprehensive high school, with its variety of educational programs adapted to the varying abilities of students.

We must discover able youth early in the elementary school years so that we may counsel them and their parents so that the young people may be pointed toward career areas where their gifts can also be used.

If these are areas where shortages exist, well and good. Fortunately, in this country the choice of a career still rests with the individual, and this connotes development of ability to make choices. One of the glories of our educational system has been that it can furnish stimulation to those who are gifted in almost any direction.

We need to expand counseling services for all youth so that we can be sure that all youth may study in areas that will help them achieve maximum use of their capabilities. This kind of guidance will help us to keep in school until high school graduation those young persons whose skills the country requires, and it will help us to send into college that half of the upper 25 per cent of academically talented youth who do not now pursue their studies beyond the high school.

We cannot afford a regression to teaching methods that ignore the findings of behavioral sciences; nor do we want an education that makes no provision for spiritual, social or emotional growth. An

education that makes such provision, as we all know, is in no way inconsistent with emphasis on the mastery of the fundamentals of learning.

Certainly we want to scrutinize curricula for any courses of really dubious value, but we shall not soon see parents repudiating health education, physical education or education for family living for leisure, for international understanding.

A few years ago, in my home city Elliott V. Bell, of *Business Week*, attending a convention of the American Banking Association, pointed out in discussing fiscal controls necessary to defend our economy against deep depressions that an indispensable factor is an intelligent, informed public opinion. He is right! It cannot be only the intellectually elite who are so informed.

I simply cannot follow the thinking of persons who seem to be saying that we should plan our education system to meet the needs of the academically talented alone. Carried to its logical and ultimate conclusion, this dangerous course would change our American society and could even change our form of government.

I believe that Americans want school programs that foster an eagerness to learn that persists throughout life. They want programs that develop in young people the ability to think critically—to solve their own problems—programs that develop intellectual integrity and willingness to be citizens in deed as well as name. They want programs that help youth develop physical and mental health, ethical and spiritual values, and a sensitivity to the creative arts.

This well-rounded person will have a sense of responsibility for the use of his talents. Charles Kettering used to say to students that action without intelligence is a form of insanity, but intelligence without considered action is the greatest form of stupidity in the world.

We hope we can help young people to realize that effective cooperation with others in the give-and-take of living does not mean that the individual must sur-



under his own personality. On the contrary, if he really understands himself, his fellows and the society in which he lives, he will contribute most if he keeps his own individuality and independence.

I think I have been saying that if we are to keep alive in this world of atoms and automation, fusion and fission, we cannot neglect the social, economic, political, world and spiritual development of all our people.

The kind of education I have been referring to the schools alone cannot provide. Schools can't teach and children can't have the values, aspirations and responsibilities that family, school and community do not cherish in common.

If our nation is to have trained manpower in every field, if it is to have well-informed, responsible electorate capable of making wise decisions that we cannot prejudge for them, we need the closest cooperation among teachers, administrators, school board members, parents and other adults.

These are demanding goals toward which each of us, in addition to school-related persons, must make an effort—a deposit, if you will, of his own interest and energy, as we help young people develop into citizens who, as Thucydides said, “will not be wanting to the city, but will make to it a most honorable contribution.”

DR. CLAPP: If I were so brash as to try to define “quality education” in ten minutes, I think I would tackle the problem under three headings.

First, I would consider the ends to be sought. Quality education surely must be the education that most fulfills human dignity; that best develops man as a reasoning, responsible, conscious being; that compels him ever farther away from the jungle; that sets him more and more apart from the insensate, the bovine, the undisciplined, the unconscious, the blindly instinctive; that makes him most able to examine life and judge what constitutes the good life. In short, quality education should aim to make better and more com-

plete men, not better butchers or bakers and more complete atom bomb makers.

Second, I would try to think of the most logical means toward those ideal ends—or at least the essential guiding principles for the choice of means, and in ten minutes I would probably only mention two such:

(a) *Seriousness*. Education is too important and school years too short to allow the luxury of the trivial, the aimless, the ineffectual, the distracting. This is no plea for drudgery but rather a confession of faith that learning can come alive and be exciting as well as useful only when it ceases to be casual, desultory, and equated with play.

Seriousness, of course, is as important in the teacher as in the pupil. We shall never have a preponderant number of eager, competent teachers (and hence shall never have a truly quality education) until we make teaching a very serious job, uncluttered by trivial and often menial occupations.

As Margaret Mead has put it most aptly, we have always worked toward the “all-purpose teacher. We have never really let our teachers teach as much as they could,” which is to say that we have never been adequately serious about education—and quality has suffered.

(b) The second guiding principle I would defend is the concept of *priorities*. Schools must have what Mortimer Smith has called “a selective and not an indiscriminate and miscellaneous function.”

Manifestly, schools cannot do everything, although they often seem to be trying. Quality education will not come from the kind of schools that William Cornog has dubbed “super social service stations,” but from schools that concentrate on a few of the things they can do best and that no other agency can do.

This seems to define quality education in terms of the transmission of our heritage in an orderly pattern and the progressive training of minds to use knowledge gained, in rational ways. The important thing here, it seems to me, is whether or not we accept the basic principle of a hierarchy, if you please, of subjects, or

simply believe that a subject is a subject is a subject.

By "orderly pattern" of transmission I am simply suggesting the conventional breakdown of learning that civilized man has laboriously achieved to keep his universe from looking like a big, impenetrable blur. As John Latimer has said, "It is no accident that the main core of those subjects (without which life in the modern world is inconceivable) is the same in all civilized countries—mathematics, science, foreign languages, history, and one's own native tongue." To these should surely be added, presumably in lesser doses, a few carefully selected other things, notably art and music.

But if the essential curriculum is ever to be done thoroughly, we must severely limit and subordinate (or eliminate) the vocational and merely social, and all those other activities that have come to pre-occupy schools largely for the sake of community convenience, since schools are such handy places to catch children for health checks and Red Cross drives, and so on and on.

My concept of the quality curriculum does not, of course, belittle the social and moral aspects of man. It does assume that morality, philanthropy, social sensitivity, and the like, are only taught indirectly, pervasively, derivatively, by the total effort of schools and teachers and society—not, to put it bluntly, through courses in boy-girl relations or driver education.

Third, and finally, by way of crossing T's, I would relate quality education to the problem of individual differences. Is quality education the same for all? In absolute terms of end results, of course the answer is "No." In terms of substance and general process, however, I think the answer must be "Yes."

If we ever agree on the best curricular focus for education toward human dignity, it is hard to see why that focus would not be most appropriate for the dignity of all humans. It is not people of my persuasion who argue for basic education for a little intellectual elite, and a substitution of "marketable skills" for the masses. We

are not ready to accept the easy but untested assumption that only 15 or 20 percent of American children can profit from serious intellectual pursuits.

The great middle range of students may well require special grouping, peculiar methods of instruction, different paces. It seems to me that the dream of quality education for all is first of all a challenge in which we ought to be doing everything possible not to arrange according to where we start, pushing it here and here and here—different patterns for such a widely varied program such as so many would have, but a challenge to make up for the shortcomings of the less privileged when they start in school, when they come to school with apparently lower I.Q.'s than the elite, but where, if you really could get at whatever an I.Q. is, you will find that some of this is simply a lack of background, from families where nothing is read, in contrast to families where everything is read, and so on. The challenge, then, is of making up for lack, not moving them off to one side.

We think that an earnest trial—whatever it takes to push each child as hard as he can go in whatever subjects we become persuaded are the ones that can do the job of education for human dignity—we think such a program as this might just prove that under optimum circumstances all but the few clearly uneducable could proceed through the essential curriculum to a high degree of self-fulfillment as rational men and responsible citizens, liberated men through liberal education, if you please.

DR. WILLIS: I agree most heartily with Dr. Clapp's position that quality education should aim to make better and more complete men. This is, of course, also the goal of the Judeo-Christian religions.

The point is how to do this, and in what frame of reference one considers a man "complete." This is the question public education faces in grades kindergarten through 12 across America.

I agree with Dr. Beck in that the question of quality in education is a philo-



sophical one. I share his misgivings about the use of "quality" as an adjective in the phrase now so commonly used, "quality education."

May I comment on some conceptions of what the term "quality education" means. To many people the idea of high quality pertains to tough courses—whatever *that* means. Machine shop would be tough for me, and perhaps for some of you also; yet we all hope, when our cars or appliances need attention, that the grease-smearing mechanic will have had a quality education in his field.

Another frequent conception is that preparation for college is synonymous with quality education. Moreover, almost all (but significantly *not all*) persons advocating quality education talk about bright students, and they mean students bright in academic pursuits. Quality education and intellectualism have somehow merged in these conceptions; yet education is vital to all people everywhere on earth, regardless of their academic competence.

Perhaps by this time you may have concluded that I do not hold these concepts as the be-all and end-all of quality education—that they do not square with what I find. If so, you are right. Quality education should be—must be—broadly based. It must reach and assist all our children.

In elementary schools we have vertically the whole population in the age group. This includes the child whose home has not one single book, as well as the son of the scholar. It includes the child to whom inside plumbing is as novel as Shakespeare. What is quality education for him? His is the frame of reference in which many of us must run the caucusrace.

Gradually this school population becomes more and more selective, until unfortunately a minority is left at college entrance and even fewer at college graduation.

John Gardner, in the Annual Report of the Carnegie Corporation of New York, has written:

"In June of this year some 1,873,000

boys and girls will graduate from high school, and approximately 993,000 of these will go on to full- or part-time college work. I want to talk about the 880,000 boys and girls who will not go to college at all—and about an additional 900,000 who dropped out even before high school graduation."

I wonder if you worry about such statistics as much as I do. I wonder if you think of the national loss such figures reflect. I wonder if you question our mutual efforts as much as I do when these figures are known to be reality—to be the boy down the street, the daughter of the cashier in the community bank.

The answer, I find, is clear, as is John Gardner's answer: "Most parents, teachers, and counselors have given little or no thought to the ways of learning and growing that do not involve college.

"To be specific, every high school in the land should provide continuing vocational and educational counseling for all who leave school short of college. These services should be available until the boy or girl reaches the age of 21. As things stand today, the high school does not provide such follow-up.

"When the populace as a whole comes to recognize that education should be an enduring thing in their lives and can take place in a variety of settings, then the artificial emphasis on certain types of education will recede. Emphasis will be on individual fulfillment and personal growth, however they may best be furthered; they will be sought for all."

Quality education requires us to diversify our curriculum in every dimension. We shall have to break through the academic wall surrounding achievement and making of it a little island in a sea of practical endeavor. It is true we must look at something beside intellectual skills and honor what we find with our respect.

To advocate having a program of education that will be meaningful to the majority does not imply that a stimulating program of studies for the academically talented and another for the gifted will be short-changed or belittled. Indeed,

I can think of no finer way to raise the level of academic study than to diversify our curriculum to such a degree that young people of many talents may be well served.

As I have read about education in other countries and traveled on educational missions I have come more and more to realize what a unique institution our American educational system is in the world at large. We have no country-wide examination for eleven year olds, no areas of our country without schools, no elite in school, and no forced program of education.

Instead, our educational system reflects the philosophy of our country: Equality of opportunity, and self-determination as to one's acceptance of that opportunity. Translated into the dimension of quality education, this means that any program of education worth its salt—or tax money—must provide for all the children of all of the people. It must give them scope to develop their best potentialities, whether academic or not. It must be concerned with each individual as an individual. In this context, again I ask, what is a tough course?

Fundamentally, great teaching depends upon our preparing, finding and encouraging great teachers. It depends upon our providing them not only with rooms and blackboards and chalk but with the newer materials, electronic aids and supplies they need. Quantity—of staff and supportive materials and services—has a direct bearing upon the quality of our school program and upon our product.

Teachers must be encouraged and assisted to experiment and to dare to question what they have been doing. It is my experience that for many persons, both in and out of teaching, self-appraisal is a difficult exercise when it requires a searching study of the tried and true.

Yet, without study where can we go?

Without innovation how will progress come? Creativity is the antithesis of complacency and self-satisfaction.

These are some of the demands upon the teaching ranks whereby education of high quality—and ever higher quality—can be achieved. Teachers, however, cannot walk this road alone. Public confidence, interest and support are fundamental. Teaching is often anonymous work, but if it is devoid of support and isolated from the interest of the kindred educational levels and the public, it is lonely and frustrating indeed. Creative teaching, unlike creative art or music or literature, is a group endeavor.

There are some who question the ability of a nation to bring to full flower the seed of the idea responsible for our American system of education. It began in the minds of men of great vision. To them it was contradictory to attempt to build a truly free society and to countenance an ignorant populace with a cult of intellectual elite. This magnificent idea now lies in our hands. It is for us to realize it through imagination and respect, or to stifle it through bigotry and short-sightedness.

The world is on the verge of an era completely undreamed of even fifty years ago by most men. With space ships and satellites transferred from fiction to fact, with annihilation a daily possibility, and a strange new world as an alternative, it is unthinkable to me that education, which has made it all possible, will not provide the leadership for progress.

If quality education means anything at all, it must mean this: More varied educational patterns, more nearly total educational opportunity, and more effort to raise the level of all. The only education of high quality is education that reaches all of the children of all the people and treats each as a dignified and worthy individual with potential. The only way to explain this concept is to do it.



VAL H. WILSON,  
*Skidmore College, Saratoga Springs, New York*

# Producing Quality Education for All\*

WHAT DO WE MEAN by quality? Who determines when an institution of higher learning is producing quality education for all? What are the essential conditions under which quality education occurs? Is quality the peculiar possession of an intellectually elite group or applicable to all? Is there not an irreconcilable chasm between quantity and quality or can there be "quality in quantity"? Is a quality education measurable? If so, how? Does it include non-intellectual attributes?

These and a host of other questions are the concerns of the North Central Association as they are of every school system, every college and university in the nation. It certainly would be inappropriate for me to attempt any definitive answers to these provocative queries; in fact, some of them are perhaps unanswerable. We are still groping for accurate methods by which to judge a college's educational quality.

My task, as I see it, is to state and define the problem; to paint with bold strokes some of the major lines of concern; to leave the details to be filled in by the panel and workshop groups.

While some of the questions you have raised may be unanswerable, nevertheless you are to be congratulated on the selection of the theme. With all the immediacies of college administration, too few of us take time to reflect upon the philosophy, aims, and purposes of the institution for which in part, at least, we bear some responsibility.

In dealing with the subject there is an ever-present danger that we substitute a verbal idol, a vague meaning of the notion of quality for the difficult task of defining, creating, producing a qualitative program

of learning.

In a real sense the word "quality" has become a new deity in the educational Parthenon. Convocation and commencement oratory unlimited is flooded with flowing tribute and lofty hallelujahs singing its praises. It would be interesting, for example, to note how many words have been sung to the "pursuit of excellence." Let me hasten to confess my own sin in this respect, though not an original one!

Americans love verbal slogans.<sup>1</sup> They have a way of anesthetizing educational bodies. The situation is akin to the current twin idols of existentialism, "being" and "becoming." According to Paul Tillich, it takes "courage to be" even though most of us have difficulty defining "being," not to mention "becoming."

These verbal idols are ever with us. If we are not speaking about "Organization Man" we are concerned about the "image" we convey. With one breath we lambaste the "Urge to Conformity"; with the other we become disturbed and distraught if students deviate from or transcend society's imposed conformities. We forget Nathan Pusey's warning that "Education is society's servant but also her tireless critic, for no civilization is ever worthy of worship."<sup>2</sup>

In women's colleges we pontificate about the need for "The Uncommon Woman"; yet continue an inflexible curriculum snugly cradled in the well-upholstered rut of tradition. Now, of course, we are all caught up in the "vig-uh" of the "New Frontier."

The worship of these verbal idols without a corresponding re-assessment of

<sup>1</sup> Albert Guerard, "The Quest of Excellence," *The American Scholar*, Winter 1959-1960, pp. 31-42.

<sup>2</sup> Nathan M. Pusey, "The Exploding World of Education," pamphlet reprinted from *Fortune*, September 1955, p. 16.

\* Delivered at the Second General Session of the Association's Annual Meeting, March 23, 1961. Dr. Wilson is President of Skidmore College.—EDITOR

current endeavors will arouse emotions but hardly change institutions. Indeed, verbal idols can become a substitute for action, conveying a magic hypnosis all of their own.

At the risk of being elementary let me attempt to restate an obvious yet frequently misunderstood truth. For decades we have been committed to the ideal of educational opportunity for all; yet there is still a misconception abroad that in a democracy every person, regardless of ability, should be given the opportunity to go to college. So we go through the ritual—in at least some states—of admitting thousands of young people as freshmen because state law says we must; then we proceed to separate the wheat from the chaff by the simple device of flunking carloads of these students at the end of the first semester.

This is sheer nonsense, not to mention the waste of faculty manpower and irreparable damage done to countless numbers who never should have entered the universities in the first place. No doubt there are many students occupying seats in college classrooms who should not be there; and the converse is equally true, that many top-notch young people with high college potential never go to college.

The notion that college is an opportunity available to all needs to be qualified in terms of an individual's capacity and motivation to do college-level work (a difficult thing to measure accurately) coupled with the kind and type of institution best suited for his interests, needs, and capabilities.<sup>1</sup> Quality implies not a universal mediocrity but a leveling upward.

A qualitative definition of education suggests, therefore, that all people do not have the same talents, equal abilities, or intellectual capabilities; nor does it imply that everyone should be educated in the same way and to the same degree. What

it does imply is the opportunity for each person to be educated as far as his ability will permit. The ceiling of that ability is not qualified by economic or social status, race or any other artificial limitations, "but rather by the individual capacity of the person as evidenced by his continuing achievement and the growing strength of his motivation."<sup>2</sup>

It is necessary to reiterate this fundamental premise for it is the basis upon which quality rests.

There is a further misconception abroad that only in certain so-called "prestige" institutions is there truly a quality program of education. The inference is drawn immediately that all other colleges and universities are second-rate, or at least qualitatively inferior, to a handful of venerable institutions.

Many of us thoroughly enjoyed the distressing dilemma of a mythical college, as reported in the *College Board Review* magazine, wherein its selective policy of admissions boomeranged when the students turned out to be superior to the faculty!<sup>3</sup> Some of you will recall the candid address given by Lawrence A. Kimpton, then Chancellor of the University of Chicago, who in a talk before the American Association of Land Grant Colleges, created a slight furor by stating that the private institutions existed to train an intellectual elite while the tax-supported institutions' task was to carry out the American dream by educating a "broad democratic majority."<sup>4</sup> He operated on the assumption that "every young person in America is entitled to the opportunity for an education" apparently without regard to ability, and he readily admitted that a high percentage would "drop out" because they are unequal to the opportunity."

I seriously question this basic premise for what it adds up to is that, since we

<sup>1</sup> T. R. McConnell, "Problems of Distributing Students Among Institutions with Varying Characteristics," *The North Central Association Quarterly*, January 1961, pp. 226-238. Cf. Samuel M. Goodman, "The Assessment of School Quality," The State Education Department, Albany, New York, March 1959.

<sup>2</sup> Samuel B. Gould, *Knowledge is not Enough* (Yellow Springs, Ohio: The Antioch Press, 1959), pp. 152-153.

<sup>3</sup> Peter Schnag, "Crisis at Rocky Hill," *College Board Review*, Fall 1960, pp. 16-17.

<sup>4</sup> Lawrence A. Kimpton, "The Public and Private University," pamphlet.



cannot have both quantity and quality, we must educate a few well and a large number less well. In other words, private education exists for the privileged few while public education exists for the undifferentiated mass.

If we are serious about producing a quality education for all then the words "for all" are limited by the definition of quality education. Certainly at the university level, both public and private, only those who have the ability (as nearly as we can measure ability) should be admitted. I see nothing undemocratic in having selective standards for admission both in public and private universities. The recognition of differences in ability levels are not "judgments of differences in human worth." It is common knowledge that some of the prestigious institutions, at least in the Midwest and Far West, are the tax-supported universities which are producing scientists, artists, and humanists of high productivity and quality.

Furthermore, to maintain that only a handful of "name" institutions are concerned with quality is to be guilty of narrow parochialism which tends to provide a "sequestered upperclass" education for only one stratum of society. Even a private college or university (and what institution is really private?) has a public duty to meet the needs of all socio-economic groups rather than to compete with one another for a homogeneous segment of wealthy students. Chancellor Kimpton's view,<sup>1</sup> which is shared by others, smacks of both social and intellectual snobbery that comes dangerously close to a vulgarizing of our democratic institutions.

I believe strongly in the development of the most able and talented student to the "outer limits of his capacity," but I do not think this task is the peculiar province of a relatively small number of "name" institutions.

At the University of Kansas the program of acceleration and enrichment for the gifted students is illustrative of what

can be done.<sup>2</sup> A democracy cannot thrive if it pays below par for the currency of quality in any institution of higher learning. We need not fewer but more first-rate colleges and universities, both public and private, and there is some evidence that we are now discovering an expanded list of top-flight institutions. How a college acquires a reputation for quality is exceedingly difficult to explain.

We may well be on the verge of a new era wherein the image of quality in the "name" institutions is so overpowering that even superior students are discovering other quality colleges and universities not so well known, some of which are west of the Alleghenies! If this is so, it is one of the most positive portents on the educational horizon.

David Riesman has developed an interesting theory that those who teach graduate students from the "prestige" institutions have noticed a "kind of decompression effect in a 'high octane situation'" by which he means that, while these students score high on standard aptitude tests, they "turn out not to be very creative or very exciting," measured by more "wide-ranging tests."<sup>3</sup> He suggests that we might get more significant data from "studies which look at different psychological or personality variables among students" and then discover what kind of collegiate setting would be best for them.<sup>4</sup>

It is interesting to note in this connection that Harvard was disturbed by the failure of the University to hold the interest of outstanding freshmen. In an attempt to alleviate the problem, Harvard two years ago introduced a program of freshman seminars under the direction of outstanding scholars.<sup>5</sup> Here we look to the behavioral sciences for much more illumi-

<sup>2</sup> From *Carnegie Corporation Quarterly*, July 1959, pp. 1-3.

<sup>3</sup> David Reisman, "Some Problems of Assessing (and Improving) the Quality of a College," *Higher Education in the United States*, ed. Seymour Harris (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960), p. 173.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> Seymour Harris, "Some Broad Issues," *Higher Education in the United States*, ed. Seymour Harris (Cambridge Harvard University Press, 1960), p. 19.

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*

nating studies of this problem.

The whole issue of quality education for all thrusts deeper. The word "quality" is an illusive concept. From the student perspective, if we define it solely in terms of astronomical scores on College Board Tests and super-high Intelligence Quotients, then we correlate quality with the exceptional student on an intellectual basis, leaving out a whole range of other qualities including "human virtues as a whole."<sup>1</sup>

From the institutional viewpoint, Paul Lazarsfeld's study entitled *The Academic Mind* does attempt to develop a quality index on the basis of certain weighted measures such as size of library, proportion of Ph.D.'s, attendance of students at graduate schools, and the like.<sup>2</sup> While extremely valuable, much more research is needed on those qualities which extend beyond strictly intellectual virtues.

For the sake of discussion, I would suggest that quality covers a range on the educational spectrum, that there is not a "unilinear path" of quality; that quality connotes a process rather than an end, and that you cannot define the process without reference to the ends or purposes of education. Dare we assume, for example, that a quality education is restricted to the one out of ten students who has an I.Q. of over 120, and that all others who do not meet this standard are ruled out? Is quality to be measured by some absolute fixed standards, by superior intellectual capacity, by the student's own progress on the path of learning, by value concerns which include but go beyond intellectual attainment?

I question whether we want a single concept of quality, nor does a range necessarily imply a resignation to mediocrity. The reverse is true for, by insisting upon a single standard of quality, we are in effect imposing a limitation upon the development of individual uniqueness.

With the wide diversity and differences among our educational institutions and the corresponding ranges of quality, however difficult these are to discern, each institution must declare its philosophy, state its aims, and define its program not in terms of a common likeness or a single standard of achievement, but in terms of its own concept of educational distinction. Each college or university must determine its own native character and uniqueness.

Furthermore, institutions of higher learning vary considerably within the life of each institution insofar as the quality of particular programs goes.

Recognizing the diversity of aims within and among many different types of colleges and universities and given certain conditions, is it possible to seek a quality program in a technical institute, a community college, a two year residential college, and among the varied types and patterns of four year institutions?

Whether any institution of higher learning will ever reach the Utopia of quality is questionable. Some will always be better than others. Continuum of education can never be plotted on a straight line but quality, like perfection, is worthy of pursuit.

*First of all*, there must be no evasion of a clearly-formulated statement of the philosophy and objectives of each institution together with the appropriate methods and corporate life for achieving those objectives. All aspects of the college's program should be given constant re-appraisal in order to state fresh, affirmative purposes which make more sense than the fuzzy, antiquated cliches used for propaganda purposes in college catalogues. A clear sense of purpose covering the nature of the learning process and how it takes place is essential.

An examination of purposes is obviously beyond our time limit. May I refer you to a study made by the American Assembly, entitled, *The Federal Government and Higher Education*.<sup>3</sup> The volume is edited by a member of your Association, Presi-

<sup>1</sup> Huston Smith, "Values: Academic and Human," *The Christian Scholar*, Winter 1960, pp. 274-290.

<sup>2</sup> Paul F. Lazarsfeld and Wagner Thielens, Jr., *The Academic Mind* (Chicago: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1958), pp. 29-34, 159-191.

<sup>3</sup> Douglas M. Knight, (ed.) *The Federal Government and Higher Education* (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1960).



dent Douglas M. Knight of Lawrence College. He wrote the stimulating and provocative first chapter entitled, "Purposes and Policy of Higher Education."

Illustrative of the absence of a clearly-articulated philosophy is a recent announcement from the board of trustees of a new college to open next fall. The board states that the faculty and curricular offerings will be determined by the courses for which prospective students have registered! Such a supermarket concept of education dispensing tidbits of knowledge does cater to mediocrity, utterly eliminating any concern for standards, not to mention quality. What a preposterous situation this indicates when we admit students to meet a budget and then decide what kind of institution we shall have!

One of the most disturbing omens is the desire on the part of certain institutions to break out of their logical pattern in order to gain additional prestige, revealing thereby "certain human qualities" of ambition, greed, and lust for power.<sup>1</sup> Often such pressures come from local civic leaders with pull in the legislature, aided and abetted by college administrators who view the move up the educational ladder as an indication of civic and educational advance. A good technical institute, for example, is not happy to remain a technical institute; it aspires to be a four-year college without regard to neighboring colleges which may be meeting adequately the needs of students in the area. Similarly, the duplication of offerings among a number of institutions within close proximity to each other leads not only to institutional rivalry but also to an annual battle for support. This too is an indictment of the lack of educational vision and statesmanship.

Secondly, a quality program of education for all cannot tolerate shoddiness of performance under any guise. No student should be coddled with the comfortable illusion that lazy, sloppy work is as accept-

able as that which comes from the hard core of disciplined endeavor. The "cult of easiness is the handmaiden of mediocrity."

We have tried too hard sometimes to make learning painless with just enough academic novocaine administered to eliminate the sharp point of the probing question, the incisive thought, or the root of a problem. High standards of performance and distinguished attainment, whether it be a seminar on Plato or the assembling of an electronic gadget, are the essential hallmarks of a quality education.

The concept of quality should embrace many kinds of achievement at many levels.<sup>2</sup> Both artist and thinker, engineer and medical technician, must be confronted by a concern for high quality.

It is true some activities call for a greater dimension of depth particularly where abstract intellectual endeavor is concerned. Can we, however, equate quality with theoretical pursuits alone? The purpose of some institutions, to be sure, is defined as that of the development and enhancement of reflective thought. We require this emphasis for American culture stands in need of artists and thinkers who are the creators and originators of new advances in the arts and sciences, and not merely the manipulators of the status quo or sheer imitators.

We dare not ignore the exceptional persons who give us the fresh insights, the novel accomplishments, which our age demands. Do we not need also the craftsmen, the technicians, the experts in human relations who, within the range of their competencies and superior skills, advance the qualitative aspects of our common life?

In other words, the continuum of learning includes both the advancement of the immediate needs of our complex society as these needs are reflected in heightened skills, useful techniques, *and* the advancement of enduring and ultimate values about how we use and direct these skills

<sup>1</sup> William Clyde DeVane, *The American University in the Twentieth Century* (Baton Rouge, Louisiana: The Louisiana State University Press, 1957), p. 13.

<sup>2</sup> "The Pursuit of Excellence," Panel Report of the Special Studies Project, Rockefeller Brothers Fund (Garden City, New York: Doubleday Company, Inc., 1958), p. 16.

and techniques. Both the immediate and the ultimate, the practical and the theoretical, the useful and the influential, are parts of a quality program of education.

Education must produce men and women who can do things with excellence. Education somehow also has the task of producing men who can be something of worth. I agree, therefore, with Mr. Willis, who asserted the other evening that philosophical questions are involved in a definition of quality education. In fact, one of the purposes of higher education is to form some coherent view of man. Who is he? Where is he? What can he do with the powers which are his?

Granted, it is much easier to determine and to measure quality in a technical field when there is an immediate usefulness, yet we dare not push aside the question concerning the use to which we put our technical knowledge and skills. Our colleges must produce trained technicians, but beyond technicians we need also men of wisdom and understanding or, to use Whitehead's great phrase, men who have a "habitual vision of greatness."

Quality learning does not include certain non-intellectual attributes for there is no rigid category which states that some vocations and professions have more quality than others.

Quality education for all, therefore, runs through the whole spectrum of education and is not reserved only for those endowed with superior intellectual excellence. We dare not forget the brilliant student, but every educable person has the right to a top-grade education. There can and must be "quality in quantity."

A *third* and obvious condition for quality education is the acquisition and retention of top-flight faculty personnel. The caliber of teaching or, to be more accurate, the conditions for learning which teaching creates is the *sine qua non* of any quality program of education for all.

Obviously we are already in a period where, in some areas, there is a deficit of talent in the academic market-place. The situation may get worse before it gets better. The "raiding" of faculties is already

underway and competition will become even more fierce. Nicely worded policy statements emanating from educational associations about ethical hiring practices among institutions are flouted daily.

While we have generated national concern over the plight of faculty salaries, we allowed the situation to develop in the first place. We poured millions into elaborate plants with Waldorf Astoria ballrooms, magnificent swimming pools, and game rooms, not to mention football stadia, while all the time we required faculty members to take the mendicant's vow of poverty. Are we really concerned about a quality program of education, or have the outward symbols of worldly success penetrated the venerable Halls of Ivy emasculating our avowed aims? Are we not denying quality by the very ways in which we pursue it?

Unless we can reverse the emphasis, and soon, we will not attract first rate minds to the teaching profession, and our plight will indeed be serious. In a country bursting with visible manifestations of wealth, the low status we have assigned to a college professor is symptomatic of our value structure. We cannot provide quality with yesterday's means. The compensation must be adequate to the quality of the product, else the product will decline enormously in quality.<sup>1</sup>

Belatedly, through assistance from various foundations and some legislative bodies, attempts are being made to remedy this intolerable situation. Time alone will tell whether the assistance on salaries and the emphasis on uncovering new sources of teaching talent will be too little, too late. Certainly some of us in liberal arts colleges have viewed with scorn any responsibility to fire the best students with enthusiasm towards a teaching career. Fortunately, the trend is being reversed.

Nor have we looked inwardly to examine ways wherein teaching effectiveness could be improved. Perhaps the sheer pressure of numbers and the concomitant

<sup>1</sup> C. W. DeKiewiet, "Tomorrow is Too Late," *The Educational Record*, July 1957, p. 196.



shortage of able faculty will prod us into a thorough re-examination of time-honored and tradition-encrusted ways of doing things.

I hold no special brief for the Ruml plan of teaching ratios, but on one issue he makes sense: namely, the degree to which we (I mean faculty as well as administrators) have proliferated course offerings.

The packaging of education into limitless numbers of academic courses has become an obsession reminding us of the comment of an English writer who defined a university as a "place where a multitude of studies are conducted with no particular relationship to each other save that of simultaneity and juxtaposition." I was appalled to discover in my own college that some sixty-three courses were offered with six or less students enrolled. Some of these offerings were essential for a proper sequential exposure of a student in her major field, but many of them crept in by a silent process of accretion. In a setting where objective truth is pursued, it is strange that we have given so little attention to some glaring inequities. It was President Johnson of Fisk University who said that "keeping classes small by hiring poor teachers simply enables the teacher to communicate his mediocrity in an intimate environment."<sup>1</sup> Mark Hopkins could have had a few more students at the other end of the log!

Perhaps no problem, at least in the private college, is more frustrating than that of finding the funds to improve faculty salaries. Our tuitions are already high, our scholarships frugal, the needs of our building program staggering. It is around this pivotal question of adequate faculty compensation that a quality education in the years ahead will revolve. Undoubtedly, the well-endowed private college or university will meet the competition and survive. The marginal institutions, however, will have a rough time holding competent

faculty. In all probability, we shall see a sharp polarization among institutions of higher learning in the next decade. The good ones will become better, thus confirming the cliché that the "good is the chief enemy of the best," the mediocre will become inferior or collapse altogether.

This crisis thrusts to the forefront the vexing and controversial question of how far private colleges should go in accepting direct aid from state or federal sources. The issue may be purely academic for some institutions as it may mean the difference between a smaller number of quality colleges or even the life and death of some institutions.

There are many other conditions which lead to a quality education for all. I would like to make a final comment on a more intangible factor; namely, the ethos or dominant climate of an institution.

Able and competent faculty must have adequate compensation, but beyond the monetary considerations are such things as the quality of one's faculty colleagues and their disposition to engage in meaningful intellectual dialogue; the ways in which the "gestalt" of the college is conducive to genuine learning; the high level of expectancy within the student body with respect to intellectual endeavor; the attitude of the administration toward academic freedom and the support it gives to academic pursuits; the quality of integrity and vision with which the administration deals with vexing problems; the kind of milieu of the campus which prizes imaginative searching and creative thinking—these are some of the intangible values which give a college a sense of aliveness and excitement, which give a stamp of uniqueness to some institutions. The campus ethos is best symbolized by a statue at one of Europe's oldest universities. In the center of the University of Cracow, Poland, stands Copernicus dressed in his academic robes. Around the base of the statue are the famous words of Lucretius, "He sent his mind beyond the flaming ramparts of the world."

<sup>1</sup> Alvin C. Eurich, "Better Instruction with Fewer Teachers," *Current Trends in Higher Education*, 1956, p. 11.

## Producing Quality Education in Secondary Schools\*

QUALITY, as I am using the term in my remarks, includes those characteristics that make education distinguished and excellent. You can amplify that. Furthermore, I am here primarily to discuss the production of quality in the secondary schools, and I would like to delimit it to the public secondary schools, which I know best.

Quality is produced in schools through the interaction of many factors, but I expect to discuss only one, *people*. Dr. James B. Conant and many other distinguished authorities have discussed other important factors, such as school organization and curriculum, which I recognize as essential to a comprehensive treatment of the subject. I have chosen *people* as the subject of emphasis for my remarks because I believe people, that is, distinguished and highly regarded people, is the indispensable and least discussed factor in producing quality in secondary schools.

The general category of people includes three principal groups that are related directly to public secondary schools:

1. The professional staff of the schools and the school system, such as teachers, counselors, supervisors, and administrators.
2. The board of education.
3. The pupils and parents.

The professional staff is my first and greatest concern today as I discuss people who can be most influential in achieving quality in secondary schools.

"The finding of appropriate ways to develop the intelligence of young people, with full recognition of the differences in

their native ability, so that they can make wise choices concerning the purposes and ordering of their individual lives and the ends and the ordering of society and government is, I am convinced, the great problem of the modern American high school and will certainly be the greatest problem of the high school of the new era."<sup>1</sup>

The most prominent common requirement to achieve such an objective in our secondary schools is to have teachers of intelligence and competence who have themselves become examples for the pupils. If we are to achieve quality, quality must be a part of the value system of pupils and teachers. Indeed, if a dominant objective to be achieved in pupils is distinguished and excellent behavior, then we must look to the value system of teachers for a large part of the motivation.

Recent studies in how children and youth acquire values seem to place much importance in the fundamental mechanism of identification. The child first identifies himself with his parents. Soon teachers can and do become significant figures in the life of the child. Hence, if we are concerned about quality in learning as a value, we must look to the parents and the teachers. If we could add to these most influential persons the example of the community, we would go far in making clear to pupils that quality in education is a value to be desired.

The board of education is the controlling authority in most communities where public secondary schools operate. Its con-

\* Delivered at the Second General Session of the Association's Annual Meeting, March 23, 1961. Dr. Oberholtzer is Superintendent of Schools, Denver, Colorado.—EDITOR

<sup>1</sup> Clarence H. Faust, "Essential Qualifications of Teachers For the New Era," *The High School in a New Era*, The University of Chicago Press, 1958, p. 127.



trol of the budget, of the courses of study, and of the employment of the professional staff affects the quality of schools to a high degree. Most school boards function as policy-making bodies and leave the detailed school operations to the professional staffs. Boards are generally responsible directly to the citizens and usually reflect those standards of quality that the communities hold for the schools. However, boards have a major responsibility for leadership in helping to raise the standards of achievement in the schools. This can be accomplished best through the leadership and competence of the professional staff when it is given discretion in its operations and guidance through board policies.

But the people of the community, especially the pupils and the parents, play a crucial role in the production of quality in the schools. The regard that pupils and parents have for intellectual attainment, for study, and for teachers, is basic to any assessment of the achievement of pupils in schools. The presence of books in the homes, provisions for home study, the prevalence of parent-teacher conferences, and the educational attainments of the parents themselves are some of the indicators that point toward production of quality in schools.

My major premise is that the essential task confronting us in producing quality in secondary schools is to provide more persons who are distinguished teachers; so I conceive my opportunity in this talk as an opportunity to suggest ways in which we may bring about more distinguished teaching in more of our high schools, to the end that we may achieve a higher quality of pupil learning, not for some but for all pupils.

This major premise, confronted and pursued as we are capable of doing, can have a profound effect not only on our own schools but also on the schools of many other nations. People in less developed areas of the world are looking to us for leadership to help them solve their educational problems. In one sense of the term, we could export no product that

would be received more favorably than would teachers. People in the new countries of Africa place a high value on education, possibly higher than we do at this moment; but we are not prepared to export many teachers. The effects of such a venture were notable in the early development of the Philippines when we sent teachers there.

To achieve higher quality in secondary schools through more distinguished teachers, I suggest the following four-point program:

1. *Provide better incentives for more of our most capable people to enter into preparation for the teaching profession, incentives related to both undergraduate and graduate study. We need more people of the highest intellectual ability to enter the teaching profession.* There are great demands for more people in the other professions, demands that must be recognized when we consider the entrance of people into the teaching profession. Because of the pressure of these other demands, we must give special attention to teaching. Incentives in the form of scholarships, fellowships, loans, sabbatical leaves of absence with pay, and the like, have been helpful but they have not been adequate.

The provisions made under Title II of the National Defense Education Act have apparently met some of the needs. Such programs as the John Hays Fellows Program and the North Central Search-For-Talented-Students Project have been stimulating. But both private and public funds are needed in greater amount to help persuade more of our most able young people to enter the teaching profession.

2. *Provide strong basic salary schedules and other benefits comparable to those of other professional groups, but add a factor that is not applied now in many schools. This is the factor of providing financial compensation, beyond the customary arrangements, for those most distinguished teachers who remain in our secondary schools.* The prevailing salary schedules for teachers are based principally on preparation and experience, with minimums

and maximums that are applicable to all teachers who meet certain common standards. Rarely is there any provision for the uncommon person, for the outstanding person, except as he may be recognized by promotion to a supervisory or administrative position.

We admittedly treat unequals as equals in our payment of teachers largely because of our inability to distinguish objectively between the two. So long as we maintain this position I see little prospect of gaining the salary maximums that the teaching profession needs and deserves for attracting and retaining a more equitable proportion of the best brains in our country. We need research, not only of the sort that we have going on now in schools across the nation, but also of a larger scope to help achieve more objective ways of identifying and rewarding our best teachers.

3. *Provide for better utilization of teachers' talents.* Over the years we seem to have accumulated many tasks for teachers that do not require the preparation or the competence of a professional person. Part of the reason for this lies in the functions which we have accepted for schools generally, such as participation in fund drives, serving lunches, conducting recreation or play areas; and the like. The assumption of the less-skilled duties by other persons has gone forward more slowly in schools than in other institutions where competitive aspects have forced changes. Provisions for secretarial help, for machine operations, for teacher aides, and the like, are to be found in an increasing number of schools; but the application is not very extensive. It has been estimated that improvement of from 25 percent to 50 percent is possible in the utilization of teacher talents.

The advent of television, of tape recorders, of teaching machines, and of programmed instructional materials has provided us with new horizons in the assignment and utilization of teacher talents. The teacher remains the central figure in relation to these changes, but he assumes a much different role than he did formerly.

That role is essentially to conduct a program of instruction with the aid of the newer media and techniques which will induce more self-direction, more individual pupil activity without the necessity of as much individual teacher attention to drill or repetitive aspects of learning. This will make it possible for us to meet more needs of ever increasing numbers of pupils with higher quality instruction.

Although research is being conducted in the general field of teacher utilization, much more could be done and should be done. The proportion of school budgets and of university budgets allotted to research in education is pitifully small compared to that allotted in science, business, agriculture, and medicine, to name a few other fields.

Another index of this situation is to be found in the allotment of funds per pupil to the several professional schools in the universities where the school of education is generally the lowest of the group.

4. *Provide a longer working year.* The necessity of a longer school day and of a longer school year for pupils has brought into sharper focus the possibility of the longer school year for teachers. The explosion and expansion of knowledge with which both pupil and teacher must cope has made necessary more time for education. Our changing society and technology which require more education than ever before, our changing occupational requirements and citizenship requirements, and our present assessment of the importance of the individual and of the importance of education to him in self-fulfillment appear to demand our consideration of a longer year for both pupils and teachers in secondary schools.

Already there is a notable trend among secondary schools to meet this situation by extending summer school opportunities to more pupils. Formerly attendance was limited to those who wanted to make up work that was not satisfactory. Now summer schools have become standard operations for other pupils who wish to extend and enrich their opportunities. This is in effect a trimester arrangement with the



third semester on an optional basis. Other schools are extending the year for pupils on a required basis. More have extended the year for teachers by either optional or required services during the summer period. Thus some teachers are receiving employment opportunities beyond the usual 180- to 200-day school year.

The extension of the year by these several methods has made possible more adequate annual salary than was the case formerly and probably affords one of the best opportunities to increase the compensation for all teachers.

*To conclude*, we are living in the midst of a world revolution and at a stage in its development when we of the United States have the complex responsibility of

facing up to the issues involved. American citizens are called upon to face, to understand, and to take action upon national and international issues of awesome gravity. As individuals we must learn to live in an ever more complex and more demanding civilization. Because of this, we believe that more and better education for all citizens is a matter of urgency and of importance to us and to the world.

Quality education in our secondary schools must be carried forward with vigor and intelligence, and I suggest that the most important task confronting us in producing quality education for all pupils is to have distinguished teachers for more pupils, to the end that we may achieve a higher quality of pupil learning.

## Quality Education for All\*

LONG AGO one of the world's great schoolmen wrote a treatise on quality education, but his work is seldom mentioned in today's literature. "The Education of a Christian Prince" by Erasmus of Rotterdam has a surprising relevance for our own day and our present theme. As the title suggests, the author was concerned about the ruler of the state and the kind of instruction he received before he assumed the burdens of office. Erasmus wrote: "Whoever will undertake the task of educating the prince, let him ponder again and again the fact that it is the greatest of all duties."

Conscious of his own great responsibility, Erasmus went on to describe his own philosophy of royal education. "The tutor should first see that his pupil loves and honors virtue as the finest quality of all, the most felicitous, the most fitting a prince; and that he loathes and shuns moral turpitude as the foulest and most terrible of things." We may question the tutor's success in his work with the future Charles V, but the name of the teacher, I would like to believe, shines more brightly today than that of his sovereign pupil. The empires of Charles are gone; the ideals of Erasmus still dominate the mind.

What neither Erasmus nor Charles foresaw four and one-half centuries ago was that revolutions would dethrone princes and monarchs. To some, that seems reason enough for ignoring the education of princes. More wondrous than the overthrow of monarchy is the fact that in America power passes to the ordinary citizen. Democracy offered the jewels of government to the common man.

\* Delivered at the Third General Session of the Association's Annual Meeting, March 24, 1961. Dr. Bergendoff is President of Augustana College.—EDITOR

What Erasmus had to say about the education of princes takes on a new meaning when it is applied to the schoolmen who are tutoring the future rulers of this commonwealth. Because the education of the ruler determines so largely the character of a nation, the quality of education is not less important if the power of government is in the hands of all its citizens rather than of an inherited few.

"There are three kinds of nobility," according to Erasmus. "The first is derived from virtue and good actions; the second comes from acquaintance with the best of training; and the third from an array of family portraits and the genealogy or wealth." The third, he says, is the lowest and by itself really no nobility at all. This means that the nobility that matters is related to "virtue and good actions" and "an acquaintance with the best of training."

In a democracy, then, we are faced with the question of whether this kind of nobility can be the birthright of every citizen, and if the education of our children can be conceived in terms of preparation for sovereign rule of the nation.

Erasmus in much of his argument fell back on a still greater teacher of an earlier millenium, namely, Aristotle, that perennial source of those who know. We today in America would do well to ponder this paragraph from the *Politics*:

"But of all the things which I have mentioned, that which most contributes to the permanence of constitutions is the adaptation of education to the form of government; and yet in our own day this principle is universally neglected. The best laws, though sanctioned by every citizen of the state, will be of no avail unless the young are trained by habit and education in the spirit of the constitution—for there may be a want of self-discipline in states as well as in individuals. Now, to have been educated in the spirit of the constitution is not to perform the



actions in which democrats delight, but those by which the existence of a democracy is made possible. In democracies of the more extreme type there has arisen a false idea of freedom which is contradictory to the true interests of the state. For two principles are characteristic of democracy, the government of the majority and freedom. Men think that freedom means the doing of what a man likes. In such democracies every one lives as he pleases, or in the words of Euripides, 'according to his fancy.' But this is all wrong; men should not think it slavery to live according to the rule of the constitution; for it is their salvation." (Book V, Ch. 9)

For Aristotle it is a fundamental fact that "the citizen should be moulded to suit the form of government under which he lives" (Book VIII, Ch. 1). He is equally certain that the permanence of a form of government depends upon education. If he could complain that this principle was universally neglected in his day, can we in 1961 say that American education is clearly designed to support and perpetuate American democracy?

If we are serious in our discussion of quality in education, we must be agreed on our criteria. Quality can be measured only in terms of standards against which we can place our achievements.

If Erasmus' third class of nobility consciously or unconsciously dominates our educational endeavor, these "family portraits" or "genealogy" or "wealth" become the tests of our quality programs. We need to inquire how far wealth or prestige or power are the driving forces of many of the wheels of our educational systems. With Erasmus I hold that this is not nobility or quality at all, no matter how many are the worshippers of these idols. If our profession of democracy is sincere, then quality in education has to do with training youth in "the spirit of the constitution." In a democracy the individual citizen participates in the rights and duties of the royal house. Today, democracy is being ridiculed by its enemies. Our great concern must be: Is education fostering the qualities demanded by self-rule?

I doubt that we can improve on Aristotle in putting a finger on the weak spot of our own democracy. Of the "two principal characteristics of democracy—the

government of the majority and freedom—men think that freedom means the doing what a man likes." Not only is this idea false, but it means finally the destruction of the state based on freedom. Nor is Aristotle willing to equate "the government of the majority" with the "supremacy of the popular will." For when there is a "want of self-discipline" the majority does not guarantee equality in a democracy any more than in any other form of government. An education that derives from the supremacy of the popular will and issues in a freedom for any man to do what he likes, is far from a quality education, and will, in the long run, not even support the system which promises such an education.

Let us look, for a moment, to another great state of our day. It is not a democracy, certainly in Aristotle's or our own sense of the word, but it does illustrate admirably, I think, the ancient thinkers' dictum on the relationships of a system of education to the spirit of the state's constitution.

Russia is a dictatorship. It is authoritarian from top to bottom. It has a constitution written by an oligarchy which has seized power and now rules a land of 200 million people. The oligarchy is the Communist party of which the Soviet constitution of 1936 says: "The most active and politically most conscious citizens in the ranks of the working class and other sections of the toilers unite in the Communist party of the Soviet Union, which is the vanguard of the working people in their struggle to strengthen and develop the socialist system, and is the leading core of all organizations of the working people, both public and state."<sup>1</sup>

This, too, is the party that determines Soviet educational policy and sets the standards of quality for the nation. In 1958 *Pravda* printed the *Theses* of the latest Soviet educational reform, and defined its quality in terms like these: "The Communist transformation of society is inalienably linked with the bringing up

<sup>1</sup> George Vernadsky, *History of Russia*, p. 579.

of a new man who must harmoniously combine spiritual wealth, moral purity and physical perfection. The man of the Communist tomorrow will be free of the unworthy characteristics derived from an exploiting regime, of private property egoism, of the desire to live at the expense of other people's labor, narrowmindedness, individualism, and so forth."

We may freely grant that the Soviet system has done a remarkable job in freeing the millions of Russian peasants from illiteracy, and has organized an effective industrial machine which is improving the natural economy. We have not been without admiration for a school system which demands attention to duty and produces results in a society dedicated to materialistic goals. We have even heard voices in America calling for a reform of our own schools to match the long hours, the compulsory courses, the hard discipline of the Russian system.

This we can understand, in time of stress, from those who do not look beneath the surface of a movement. It is, however, harder to understand how little we in America have seen the Soviet schools as an example of Aristotle's observation that a state depends on an education in the spirit of its constitution. The Communists have no illusions on this point. "Lenin," the aforementioned *Theses* of 1958 reminded Russian schoolmen, "taught that the upbringing and education of the young replacements, the training of highly qualified cadres for all branches of the economy, science and culture, must always be a matter of special concern for the Communist Party and for the Soviet State." Russian education is designed to perpetuate the rule of the Communist Party over the Soviet empire and in time over all the world.

The purposes of the Russian schools are clear. What can we say of the American system of education? Are our schools characterized by a quality of dedication to the spirit of the American Constitution? Are we producing the right kind of rulers in our land, namely, a citizenry fit to rule our kind of nation?

It can hardly be denied that there are many vestiges among us of education for the third of Erasmus' types of nobility—the family portrait, the family tree, or the prestige of wealth. When we speak of quality education, something of the southern plantation idea of "quality folk" echoes in our mind, or something of the phrase, "the best families."

Let us freely admit that some of our best educational manners are derived from European aristocracy. Probably we should not forget that Russian nobility learned these, too, and provoked a bitter hatred among the masses who received no education. Quality education in our land can easily turn into training for the leading clubs, either in the heart of the city or in the country. Already there are signs that the quality schools are those most mentioned in the financial or society pages of the metropolitan press.

Vainglory, however, is not the most fatal weakness of American schools. Much more serious is our lack of concern for the two principles on which, according to Aristotle, a democracy rests—the government of the majority, and freedom. If the rulers are the ordinary citizens, as in our democracy, then the quality with which we are concerned is the kind of education we are giving the ordinary citizen. We are tutoring princes in the American government. Are we preparing them for rule in a democracy?

It is no secret that Aristotle doubted the success of democracy. Closer to our own time, Abraham Lincoln asserted that it is still an experiment if government of, by, and for the people can exist on this earth. All the developments of the past century notwithstanding, Americans go blithely on the assumption that our freedom is as secure as the sunshine and we breathe its air by birth in this fair land. The very possibility of government by the majority implies that the majority may put an end to freedom. There is no law of nature that makes the majority of men lovers of liberty. The freedom that we prize in a democracy rests on the consent of the majority to the constitution which prescribes



the rights of the individual. If the majority turn to other goals, not even the constitution can guarantee the continuance of liberty. The freedom that we prize in a democracy rests on the consent of the majority to the Constitution which prescribes the rights of the individual. If the majority turn to other goals, not even the Constitution can guarantee the continuance of liberty. The education of our youth in the spirit of the Constitution alone safeguards a majority that makes a democracy real.

In a free land there is a temptation to build an educational system on the basis of letting each individual develop as he pleases. Henry Wriston makes a forceful appeal for the individual in the recent study, *Goals for Americans*. I subscribe to his judgment that "the first national goal to be pursued—at all levels—federal, state, local, and private—should be the development of each individual to his fullest potential." I fear that most Americans applaud this emphasis on the individual, and its correlate of self-expression in education while giving little thought to Wriston's qualifying statement that "liberty puts the maximum reliance upon self-discipline." In our search for quality in American education we cannot separate self-expression and self-discipline. An education that results in self-indulgence, self-aggrandizement, self-sufficiency is not in any sense a quality education whatever degrees may be achieved.

The quality of self-discipline tempers the idea of individual liberty. The freedom of one is somehow related to the freedom of all so that if the freedom of one trespasses on the freedom of another, the freedom of both is jeopardized. Each one cannot do as he pleases except as each pleases to guard the liberty of the other.

If we analyze the operation of government by the majority, we will find that the majority is made up of a group of minorities who unite to form a majority with respect to a particular matter under consideration. Were there a permanent majority on all points, we would have an oligarchy. Actually, in American politics

the majority for social security is made up of minorities on questions of labor, ownership, taxation. Majorities are fluid—flowing together, flowing apart, now for prohibition, now against, now for war, now for peace, now for isolationism, now for the United Nations. What holds this volatile multitude together is "the spirit of the Constitution," the respect for the rules of the game. Respect for the individual carries with it respect for all individuals. The only unchanging agreement of the majority is that by which all minorities have the right of self-expression—as long as they, too, agree to the rules.

For education in a democracy this has profound consequences. There is no one quality, as in a monarchy or aristocracy, that determines the character of the schools. In Europe and Russia the program of education is determined in the capital by the central government and the provinces all follow the pattern there established. There are no provinces in America, and thus far in our history the strength of our education has been in its sources in the community and the state. It is not by accident that we have had no national university in Washington. Even the state universities have not been considered the arbiters of higher education for they have been surrounded by private colleges in their own territory. The policy of governmental checks and balances has had its counterpart in American education. In fact, education has not even had a Supreme Court to pass on its differences (though sometimes we may wonder if the great foundations are going to assume this function).

The two great institutions created by the American people in education are the public school system and the land-grant colleges. These schools have in a special manner expressed the needs of the expanding nation and have been the means of providing the quality that all in a democracy demand.

The public schools have varied from the college preparatory institutions of classical content to the little red schoolhouse on the frontier teaching the 3 R's. It is easy

today to criticize both the substance and the methods of the public school system and to contrast them with the efficiency of the Russian schools. But let us remember that these schools have been indigenous to the population of our cities and countryside and they have involved multitudes of Americans in questions of education.

We have built structures and trained teachers for American life in a climate of freedom and local responsibility that no national bureaucracy could create. Not only have the public elementary and secondary schools been our first line of defense of American institutions, but they are today the basis of a new development in education, that of the junior colleges, which offer us our best hope of solving the problem of increasing school population. In our criticism of American schools let us not forget that they have produced a system of education that permits criticism and change. They have developed a democracy in education that makes of education the business of the people in every community, and not an instrument to be used by a centralized government. In no other country of the world has quality of education been the concern of as many of its citizens as in our own; nor in any country of the world that I know of is there a counterpart to this North Central Association.

We are approaching the centennial of the Morrill Act and the establishment of a system of state universities designed to meet the needs of agriculture and the mechanical arts. Here was something new in higher education. It grew out of the life of a people for whom work was not a badge of servitude but a mark of honor. President Day of Cornell, one of the leaders in the movement, claimed that "no free society has a real future in which an interest and a devotion to work does not constitute one of the prime, moving urges."<sup>1</sup> Whereas once higher education had been considered as a means of escaping work, the American land-grant universities now made it a mark of quality

to apply the highest of scientific knowledge to the most menial of human tasks. While the vocational has been a basic motive in the development of this democracy's schools, it has never been to the exclusion of the liberal arts, and the ideal has ever been to enrich the life of the individual worker with all the honor of advanced study.

A measure of the significance of the land-grant schools may be seen in the export of this idea to a great modern nation striving to raise its millions to higher levels of useful living. Last November Prime Minister Nehru formally opened the Uttar Pradesh Agricultural University and acknowledged the Indian debt to the American system and particularly to the University of Illinois. "He spoke of the dignity of manual labor, of a need in India for practical colleges rather than those that for generations have flooded the country with would-be intellectuals equipped to become little more than clerks."<sup>2</sup>

Whatever be our deficiencies today, let us be mindful of the enduring contributions made to American democracy by our public schools and our land-grant universities. They have been the means of bringing the ideal of quality for all nearer to all the citizenry than any other people has known. It is a myopic view that sees quality education in only certain kinds of schools, in certain disciplines, or even in certain books. I will take my stand with any advocate of the training of the intellectual discipline in learning to think, and will insist that this is especially necessary in a democracy. The intellect is not a house that stands on a certain street in the human community. It must be present in every house, and live with art and science and philanthropy. We may not hope that every citizen will be dominated by a trained intellect, but we shall have to strive for the goal of a democracy wherein the majority respects the place of the intellect and the schools that preserve the tradition of the intellectual life. That

<sup>1</sup> E. D. Eddy, *Colleges for our Land and Time*, p. 280.

<sup>2</sup> *N. Y. Times*, November 20, 1960.



goal is more apt to be reached if the intellectuals respect other facets of human personality and do not arrogate to themselves all that belongs to education.

Aristotle ever sees the possibility of tyranny in government—in any of its forms—and there is a kind of tyranny of the intellect which is as subversive of democracy as the tyranny of the majority. We may hope that the guardians of the intellect will use their influence and power to assist rather than resist the education of the majority. They need the guidance of teachers in other domains as much as democracy needs their judgments.

Probably the most unique test of government by the majority has been the place accorded, alongside the great and growing public institutions, those generally labeled "private." As everybody knows, all the early colleges were private, usually founded by a church denomination. In the last century public institutions have come into their own, and now for the first time enroll more students than do the private ones. It is remarkable how few expect the tax-supported schools to take over altogether, and how earnest are the efforts being made to strengthen the private colleges. No one can deny the contribution of these colleges to the qualitative standards for higher education. The will of the majority to give room to these minority groups is one of the signs of health in American democracy. They testify to the purpose of America to allow private groups to contribute to the national life and culture all that these groups can produce.

Many of the private institutions are church-related and exist to express their religious faith in terms of modern learning. They would agree with Herman Foerster's words that "whatever the dependence of man upon the social organization, man is superior to the social organization—an affirmation which must rest finally upon a humanistic or religious basis."<sup>1</sup> The function of these colleges, then, is to establish and strengthen a religious basis in educa-

tion, without which modern American education could become as materialistic as Communism. Indeed, many interpret the spirit of the American Constitution as implying a religious faith, and wonder if democracy can endure in the long run without such a faith. Certainly here is a quality of education that is as important as any other.

All that Erasmus had to say about the education of a Christian prince applies to those who look to the future rulers of America as exponents of Christian nobility. Quality resides in relationships, and it is in man's relationships with fellow men and with his God that we must seek for the finest fruits of education. The true aristocracy of education is marked by what a man is and does as well as by what he knows. Although I have no way of knowing how it could be achieved, we probably need an N.Q. or normal quotient as much as an I.Q. to express a person's quality. Ultimately the quality of education is the same as the quality of human life.

The task of educating American youth, or rather, all Americans, is too great for any one system. With all our varied schools the job is still not done. Probably we should recognize that it is too big a task even for all the schools, and give thought to other agencies which are charged with educational responsibilities. Sometimes schoolmen take their job too exclusively and give the impression that they alone are responsible for all education. They should admit that many Americans get their education outside the schools. Dr. Victor Goertzel, a psychologist and president of the National Association for Gifted Children, has studied 77 world figures and reports that "most persons who achieved eminence did not like their schools or teachers when young." Seven of the subjects studied did not complete elementary school. Seven were only elementary school graduates, fourteen did not go beyond high school, and the list includes Chancellor Adenauer, Alfred Adler, Susan Anthony, Clement Atlee, Bernard Baruch, Winston Churchill,

<sup>1</sup> *The American State University*, p. 200.

Mark Twain. It is to us a disturbing note that the study reveals "no apparent relation between the amount of schooling and future eminence."<sup>1</sup> Evidently there are other educational factors, and all of us know that the home, the church, the athletic or social organization, the library, the newspaper, radio and television, are among these factors. We might do well to include these agencies when we seek to evaluate the quality of American education.

The real springs of quality may elude our observation. They may lie deeper than in the classroom procedures and content of curriculum. They can take their rise in family relationships, in informal associations, in the silences of the inner person. We can encourage and foster the qualities we think superior, but we do not create them. Often they will appear unexpectedly. Just as often we are disappointed that they do not appear.

The quality of our life can be assessed less from within the schoolroom than in the daily routine of the nation, for the quality that counts is that which wears in the strain and stress of a people's experience. The virtue and good actions of

Erasmus' nobility reveal themselves in the market-place and arena, in the hospital and law court, in newspaper office and legislature.

Quality in education reflects the quality of the community and of the nation. The schools cannot achieve a character much different from the aspirations of all the people, for schools are as much a reflection of society as society is a product of education. It is a delusion to expect quality from the schools if the citizens of the community are not in accord with the ideals the schools pursue.

If the common man is ruler in America and we are instructing the future rulers, then Erasmus' standard to every American, teacher and student: "The tutor should first see that his pupil loves and honors virtue as *the finest quality of all*—and that he loathes and shuns moral turpitude as the foulest and most terrible of things." This is the very spirit of our Constitution, on which both our education and our freedom rest. Whether a nation conceived on the principle that the people may be fitted to rule can endure in a world threatened by the Communist slavery of the spirit of man, is a question to which we yet do not have the answer.

<sup>1</sup> *N. Y. Times*, December 11, 1960.



# Opinions about North Central Association Accreditation of Junior High Schools

THIS IS A REPORT of two related exploratory studies dealing with beliefs about the regional accreditation of junior high schools. These studies were undertaken as a result of repeated requests by junior high school principals that the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools develop a program of regional accreditation for their schools. Superintendents of schools in some states also voiced the same feeling.

These requests were heard and much deliberation ensued. Some of the leaders in the Commission on Secondary Schools of the NCA favored consideration of the idea of junior high school accreditation. Others did not. At the suggestion of the Administrative Committee, the writer agreed to conduct a questionnaire study aimed at determining how junior high school principals and their superintendents felt about such accreditation.

The results of the initial survey were generally favorable to regional accreditation of junior high schools, but not entirely so. Some persons expressed fears, and others cited cautions or objections. Therefore, the second questionnaire study was accomplished almost a year later to probe deeper into the opinions of junior high school principals about regional accreditation and its development.

## PART I: PURPOSES AND PROCEDURES OF THE STUDIES

From the beginning it was stated that the NCA was making the inquiry at the

request of junior high principals. It was also indicated that the NCA could not guarantee subsequent development of an accreditation program, and that any effort made would involve junior high school personnel. Any resultant program was to be voluntary.

### *The Initial Survey*

This survey was made in the winter of 1960. As previously suggested, it sought the opinions of junior high school principals and their school superintendents as to the desirability of regional accreditation by the NCA. The brief questionnaires were mailed by the NCA chairman in each state. The responses were returned directly to the writer.

Approximately 63 percent of the principals and superintendents responded making a total of 1,146 principals and 801 superintendents. Returns by state are given in Table I. No followup was made. Each group was advised to discuss the idea of accreditation with teachers, other administrators, board members, and laymen before responding. Such discussion apparently ensued in some cases and not in others.

### *The Second Study*

This study was started in the fall of 1960 and completed in the winter of 1961. Junior high school principals were reassured of the intentions of the NCA as stated in the initial survey. In addition, the study sought to ascertain:

1. some important features of organization, staffing and programming in junior high schools

\* Dean of the School of Education, University of Colorado, and immediate Past President of the North Central Association.—EDITOR

2. how junior high school principals felt about possible purposes of accreditation, major problems, useful processes, and cautions appropriate to the development of an accreditation program
3. the names of persons recommended in each state to assist in the development of such a program.

Questionnaires were mailed by the writer to 2,000 junior high schools listed by the nineteen NCA state chairmen. As responses were received, it became apparent that not all schools listed were actually junior high schools. Usable returns were received from about 48 percent of the total on a regional basis. This percentage suggests caution in generalizing about all junior high schools. Details are presented in Table II. The figures vary among the tables presented later because many schools did not fill out all items; for example, only 950 principals gave data as to organization and enrollments. No followup was made for, again, the study sought opinions only from those persons who were interested in responding without being coaxed.

## PART II: SIGNIFICANT FINDINGS AND OBSERVATIONS

Not all of the data called for are particularly significant at this time. Briefly stated, the following findings are appropriate for summary reporting. From the responses to the initial survey (63 percent of the total) the sentiment expressed about accreditation of junior high schools by the NCA was as follows:

	<i>Favor it</i>	<i>Oppose it</i>	<i>Uncertain</i>
J.H.S. Principals	66%	20%	14%
Superintendents	62%	20%	18%

Details are provided in Table I and later discussion.

From the second study ten summary findings have important implications. These findings, based on a 48 percent return, are as follows:

1. The great majority (72 percent) of the schools were organized as three-year junior high schools including

grades seven, eight, and nine. In some states, however, there were many two-year schools consisting of grades seven and eight. Details are given in Table III.

2. The range in enrollment of the schools was great within any one and among the nineteen states. The median size by enrollment was about 600 pupils. Details are available in Table IV.
3. Approximately two-thirds of the principals indicated the use of written policies, criteria or guidelines developed specifically for junior high schools. These materials were of local, state, or national origin. More specific data are presented in Table V.
4. Most of the principals (74 percent) viewed their junior high school as a separate and distinct organizational level rather than as an upward extension of the elementary or a downward extension of the senior high school. In Table VI details are given.
5. Departmentalized courses were offered in grades seven, eight, and nine in the great majority of schools. Core or block of time courses were offered in schools as follows: seventh grade, 41 percent; eighth grade, 29 percent; ninth grade, 6 percent. A very small percentage of schools offered instruction in self-contained classrooms. Details are presented in Table VII.
6. The majority (72 percent) of principals favored moving slowly in developing a regional program of accreditation, that is, taking from three to five years. In Table VIII more specific figures are given.
7. The majority of principals indicated that accreditation should include attention to the following ideas in serving their schools: minimum quantitative and qualitative standards, guidelines for self improvement, research and its publication, articulation of elementary,



junior high and senior high levels, the status and security of the junior high school and its personnel and resistance to adverse factors and forces. Details are provided in Table IX.

8. In response to the open end question concerning aspects or problems important in an accreditation program many different answers were given. The most prevalent response (455 principals) called for attention to teacher and/or administrator preparation for junior high school personnel. Somewhat more than half as many principals indicated a need to consider curriculum and instruction, including grade placement of subjects. Still fewer respondents called for consideration of counseling and guidance and school plant and facilities.
9. Two additional open end questions were directed to the process of developing an accreditation program and to any cautions that should be observed. Relatively few principals responded, but most of them likely would agree with the most prevalent suggestions. These were to maintain flexibility in the program to encourage experimentation, to avoid imposition of senior high school accreditation on the junior high school and to utilize junior high school personnel. Some use of elementary and senior high school personnel was also advocated.
10. In a comparatively few cases principals voiced opposition to development of an NCA regional accreditation program. At meetings in several states such opposition was stated by principals and others who did not respond to the inquiry.

#### *Pertinent Observations*

On the basis of the two studies and discussion with school administrators of many states in and beyond the NCA region, the writer has arrived at certain

observations. These views are subject to change in the light of additional evidence; they are offered now with the sole intent of taking a careful look ahead in the best interest of all concerned.

1. The NCA should undertake to provide a program of regional accreditation for junior high schools, but such program should be developed slowly and with due regard to subsequent observations and continued counsel of junior high school principals.
2. What junior high principals want may not be accreditation at all, certainly not in the traditional sense and use of the term. This point will need to be clarified.
3. Before regional accreditation can become generally acceptable and serviceable, junior high principals within each of the nineteen states will need to discuss and study the nature of junior high school education and arrive at greater agreement than now appears to exist on many important points. Motivation of such activity on the state level looms as a major contribution of regional interest and leadership.
4. It should be recognized that the unrest and tension of today probably influenced respondents in both studies. The questionnaires, therefore, may reflect apprehension that time will relieve. Notations on questionnaires and enclosed letters often reflected this influence.
5. Board members, superintendents, elementary and senior high school principals, junior high school principals, and teachers need to consider together the proper place and function of the junior high school. No one group can do this well alone.
6. Attention should be given to existing programs of junior high school accreditation and to policies, instruments, and guidelines currently usable in the appraisal of junior high schools.
7. In thinking about junior high school accreditation, there may be virtue in

TABLE I

APPROXIMATE PERCENTAGES OF JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS AND SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS  
FAVORING, OPPOSING AND UNCERTAIN ABOUT ACCREDITATION OF  
JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS BY THE NCA  
(Initial Study)

State	Percentage of Return		Favor Accreditation		Oppose Accreditation		Uncertain	
	Prin.	Supt. <sup>a</sup>	Prin.	Supt.	Prin.	Supt.	Prin.	Supt.
Arizona	25	43	50	25	29	50	21	25
Arkansas	58	73	73	70	8	13	19	17
Colorado	98	18	79	67	8	0	12	33
Illinois	42	46	76	56	12	27	12	17
Indiana	83	56	84	74	5	12	11	14
Iowa	83	59	77	84	13	7	10	10
Kansas	84	91	93	95	5	0	2	5
Michigan	66	69	63	64	18	16	19	20
Minnesota	56	56	49	62	39	27	12	11
Missouri	67	100+	72	56	11	15	17	29
Nebraska	58	70	13	0	70	91	17	9
New Mexico	57	40	54	85	35	8	11	8
North Dakota	71	17	84	67	5	33	11	0
Ohio	75	64	54	77	33	7	13	16
Oklahoma	47	56	43	44	39	40	18	16
South Dakota	75	79	93	47	0	16	7	37
West Virginia	64	71	61	60	19	27	19	13
Wisconsin	50	96	60	54	19	29	21	17
Wyoming	85	100	40	33	33	56	27	11
Totals	63%	63%	66%	62%	20%	20%	14%	18%

<sup>a</sup> In some school districts the superintendent apparently also served as junior high school principal. In these and other instances superintendents sometimes returned the junior high school principal's questionnaire, and vice versa. Consequently, there is some small error in percentages.

also considering six-year high schools.

By way of going about the development of an accreditation program, several ideas merit attention. Central leadership exercised through the NCA is vital. This should be established and exercised so as to grow out of and feed back into the committees in each state. The several state committees working on junior high accreditation should receive assistance from and work closely with the appropriate NCA state chairmen. The encouragement of this person may be very important in getting state groups started, but he should not dominate the committee. These committees should include the best talent within each state, including college and state department of education personnel. Funds, within each state and at the regional level, will be essential. Per-

haps foundation support should be sought.

As an initial step the North Central Association should encourage and help to finance a regional meeting of representatives, one chosen in each state that wishes to participate. This group should draft plans for the basic deliberation and study essential to the development of a regional accreditation program. Each state that participates should be prepared to care for the expenses of its representative. Within each state the organization of junior high school principals and/or of secondary school principals should be very helpful in these and subsequent endeavors.

### PART III: DETAILS OF THE STUDIES

The reader who wishes more information about the studies is encouraged to study the tables and peruse the comments



that follow. It should be remembered that not every respondent answered every item, so that totals will vary. In spite of this, however, the individual responses seemed to have reasonable internal consistency, and an overall picture was clear in the case of each item.

In Table I, pertaining to the initial survey, great variation is evident among states. At least 50 percent of the junior high school principals favored NCA accreditation in 15 states. This was true of superintendents in fourteen states. In one state opposition by both principals and superintendents was very strong.

Tables II through IX relate to the second and more detailed study involving only junior high school principals. Response among the states varied, although many states yielded a return of 50 to 60 percent.

Variation in organizational type calls

TABLE II

THE NUMBER OF QUESTIONNAIRES MAILED AND USABLE RESPONSES RECEIVED FROM JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

State	No. of Questionnaires Mailed	No. of Replies Received <sup>a</sup>
Arizona	24	10
Arkansas	40	24
Colorado	98	63
Illinois	390	132
Indiana	77	45
Iowa	140	76
Kansas	87	47
Michigan	324	152
Minnesota	60	32
Missouri	43	25
Nebraska	26	15
New Mexico	69	33
North Dakota	22	8
Ohio	182	91
Oklahoma	169	68
South Dakota	22	12
West Virginia	104	57
Wisconsin	88	45
Wyoming	35	15
Totals	2,000	950

<sup>a</sup> These figures include only schools that could be classified by organization and enrollment on basis of response. A total of 969 schools replied to one item on the questionnaire.

TABLE III  
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDING JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS ACCORDING TO ORGANIZATIONAL TYPE

State	Organizational Type			Totals
	7-8-9	7-8	Other	
Arizona	0	8	2	10
Arkansas	22	1	1	24
Colorado	38	25	0	63
Illinois	38	94	0	132
Indiana	22	19	4	45
Iowa	33	42	1	76
Kansas	45	2	0	47
Michigan	139	13	0	152
Minnesota	32	0	0	32
Missouri	23	0	2	25
Nebraska	15	0	0	15
New Mexico	30	3	0	33
North Dakota	6	2	0	8
Ohio	90	0	1	91
Oklahoma	54	14	0	68
South Dakota	10	1	1	12
West Virginia	51	5	1	57
Wisconsin	30	15	0	45
Wyoming	6	9	0	15
Totals	684	253	13	950

for some flexibility in an accreditation program. In four states two-year junior high schools were the most prevalent type. Four states had no such schools reporting. In the category of "other types" few schools responded and these varied quite a bit. Considerable difference in enrollment and in the number of schools of various sizes was also apparent. The influence of these differences on accreditation poses some perplexing problems.

In eighteen states the majority of the schools used written policies, criteria or guidelines. Some principals indicated little or only occasional utilization. Others stated that such materials were being developed. A total of 315 schools were not using written materials at all. This fact has some significance in considering the need for accreditation.

The overwhelming response of principals in considering the junior high school as a separate and distinct organizational level should not go unnoticed. This may reflect some feeling that the junior high

TABLE IV

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDING JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS BY PUPIL ENROLLMENT

State	Pupil Enrollment Groups						
	1-199	200-399	400-599	600-999	1,000-1,499	1,500-1,999	2,000-More
Arizona	0	1	2	6	1	0	0
Arkansas	0	2	7	13	1	1	0
Colorado	9	17	6	19	10	2	0
Illinois	25	33	20	44	9	1	0
Indiana	0	10	15	13	6	1	0
Iowa	24	21	9	15	7	0	0
Kansas	4	7	12	16	8	0	0
Michigan	4	25	27	65	23	8	0
Minnesota	1	1	6	15	6	2	1
Missouri	0	6	3	6	9	1	0
Nebraska	0	1	6	7	1	0	0
New Mexico	6	1	5	13	8	0	0
North Dakota	3	0	1	3	1	0	0
Ohio	2	5	21	38	23	0	2
Oklahoma	14	21	6	10	14	3	0
South Dakota	1	1	4	6	0	0	0
West Virginia	14	16	11	14	2	0	0
Wisconsin	7	13	8	11	5	1	0
Wyoming	2	5	3	4	0	1	0
Totals	116	186	172	318	134	21	3

TABLE V

NUMBER OF RESPONDING JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS  
USING WRITTEN POLICIES, CRITERIA OR  
GUIDELINES OF LOCAL, STATE OR  
NATIONAL ORIGIN

State	Use Policies, Etc.	Do Not Use
Arizona	9	1
Arkansas	16	8
Colorado	44	18
Illinois	79	52
Indiana	28	17
Iowa	38	37
Kansas	30	13
Michigan	94	56
Minnesota	30	1
Missouri	20	5
Nebraska	10	5
New Mexico	25	5
North Dakota	4	4
Ohio	66	25
Oklahoma	36	29
South Dakota	9	3
West Virginia	40	17
Wisconsin	30	15
Wyoming	11	4
Totals	619	315

TABLE VI

NUMBER OF RESPONDING JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS  
INDICATING VIEW OF POSITION OF JHS IN  
ORGANIZATIONAL FRAMEWORK

State	Up- ward Ext. <sup>a</sup>	Down- ward Ext. <sup>b</sup>	Sepa- rate & Distinct <sup>c</sup>	Combi- nation <sup>d</sup>
Arizona	0	0	7	2
Arkansas	2	1	19	2
Colorado	3	5	44	8
Illinois	16	7	87	15
Indiana	0	4	38	3
Iowa	6	6	57	0
Kansas	2	1	37	4
Michigan	15	20	108	2
Minnesota	4	0	24	3
Missouri	0	1	19	2
Nebraska	2	0	11	2
New Mexico	3	2	22	5
North Dakota	3	3	2	0
Ohio	3	3	78	7
Oklahoma	3	14	35	11
South Dakota	2	1	7	0
West Virginia	10	5	32	10
Wisconsin	4	2	38	1
Wyoming	3	1	8	2
Totals	81	76	673	79

<sup>a</sup> Upward extension of the elementary school.<sup>b</sup> Downward extension of the senior high school.<sup>c</sup> Separate and distinct organizational level.<sup>d</sup> Combination of two or more of a-c.



TABLE VII

NUMBER OF RESPONDING JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS REPORTING DEPARTMENTALIZED  
AND CORE OR BLOCK OF TIME PROGRAMS

State	7th Grade		8th Grade		9th Grade	
	Dept.	Core	Dept.	Core	Dept.	Core
Arizona	10 <sup>a</sup>	5 <sup>a</sup>	10	2	0	0
Arkansas	22 <sup>b</sup>	5	24	2	24	0
Colorado	60 <sup>b</sup>	18	61 <sup>b</sup>	12	38	5
Illinois	128	81	129	74	38	4
Indiana	45	10	45	6	22	0
Iowa	73	11	76	10	34	0
Kansas	47	27	47	11	45	5
Michigan	129	66	139	56	115	8
Minnesota	32	9	32	5	32	1
Missouri	25	19	25	11	24	2
Nebraska	15	8	15	5	15	1
New Mexico	32	18	33	14	29	3
North Dakota	8	1	8	1	6	0
Ohio	82	41	90	28	91	2
Oklahoma	64	14	65	7	52	2
South Dakota	12	7	12	4	10	0
West Virginia	55	6	56	5	52	5
Wisconsin	40	20	42	14	27	2
Wyoming	13	2	15	2	6	0
Totals	892	369	924	269	660	40

<sup>a</sup> Of the ten having departmentalized courses, five also have core or block of time courses. The same scheme of interpretation applies throughout.

<sup>b</sup> Two schools indicated self-contained classrooms at this grade level.

school has been something of a stepchild in the educational family. It is a known fact that in some school systems this level is a "stepping stone" to senior high schools for faculty and administrators as well as students. The many comments indicating a need for articulation suggest that principals recognized that the junior high cannot sensibly stand alone even though they do wish to have it regarded as an organizational level in its own right.

Departmentalization, core or block of time classes, and instruction in self-contained classrooms can complicate accreditation policies and criteria, particularly as regards teacher preparation. The use in junior high school of teachers trained for the elementary school cannot wisely be disregarded in looking at accreditation. Some schools indicated self-contained classrooms only for students of low ability.

As would be expected, the core or block of time classes were most prevalent at the

seventh grade level. Such classes were also found more frequently in larger schools. Variation among states was noticeable, three states having more than 50 percent of the schools offering core or block of time classes.

Although the majority of principals preferred to move slowly toward accreditation, many of them expressed a belief that time was important. Some stated that postponement would permit pressures to cause unwise action that could not easily be changed later. It would seem wise in moving slowly to move ahead constantly if possible and to keep the notion of accreditation before the public as well as before the professionals.

It would appear that various purposes of accreditation are considered to be appropriate, greater emphasis being placed on the promotion of articulation, the attainment of status, guidelines for self-appraisal and self-improvement and useful research. Quantitative and qualitative

standards were considered more important than one might have supposed without benefit of the survey results.

One other suggestion of junior high school principals merits serious attention, namely, the need for programs of preparation planned specifically for junior high school personnel. Too few colleges and universities apparently offer programs of the type judged by the respondents to be adequate. Careful and thorough study of essential attributes of successful junior high school personnel will be basic to the development of sound programs. Proper assignment and use of personnel also relate to this problem, for the junior high school is often a stepping stone for teachers and administrators, as well as for students. Only through close and effective cooperation can teacher preparation institutions and the schools solve the many and very important related problems dealing with the education of junior high school personnel. It is vital that a solution be found.

TABLE VIII  
NUMBER OF RESPONDING JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS  
WANTING NCA TO MOVE RAPIDLY OR MOVE  
SLOWLY TOWARD ACCREDITATION

State	Move Rapidly (within 2 years)	Move Slowly (about 3-5 years)
Arizona	3	6
Arkansas	6	17
Colorado	8	51
Illinois	32	89
Indiana	17	27
Iowa	23	49
Kansas	15	30
Michigan	31	112
Minnesota	5	23
Missouri	3	19
Nebraska	1	10
New Mexico	8	18
North Dakota	2	6
Ohio	24	58
Oklahoma	14	49
South Dakota	2	10
West Virginia	11	41
Wisconsin	4	39
Wyoming	1	14
Totals	210	668

TABLE IX  
THE PURPOSES TO BE SERVED BY ACCREDITATION ACCORDING TO  
RESPONDING JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

Purposes <sup>a</sup>	Extent to be Served		
	Not at All	Some Extent	Great Extent
Promote closer working relationship between JHS and elementary and senior high school	22	334	611
Assist JHS and its personnel in gaining greater status and security in the educational structure	39	316	600
Provide guidelines for self-appraisal and self-improvement	14	399	545
Engage in and publish useful educational research	35	391	543
Establish minimum standards of a <i>qualitative</i> type, for example, dealing with counseling services, the library or instruction	32	474	450
Help the JHS resist adverse forces and factors	43	409	452
Establish minimum standards of a <i>quantitative</i> type, for example, teacher qualifications or length of class periods, etc.	36	452	398

<sup>a</sup> These have been placed in order of importance using the following numerical ratings: Not at all = 0, Some Extent = 1, Great Extent = 2.



## Pros and Cons of External Testing Programs\*

THERE ARE SEVERAL WAYS that one can approach the topic of external testing. It's possible to start by taking a point of view, by marshalling facts to support that point of view, and by attempting to refute arguments that might be raised against it. On the other hand, one can simply describe what external testing is, what the problems associated with it are, and, what some of the proposed solutions are, without attempting to evaluate or to inject one's own point of view. A third alternative is to do both—to describe and to evaluate. And this is what I shall attempt to do.

This paper is essentially descriptive. First there will be a definition of external testing followed by some remarks about the types of tests being used and the functions of such tests. Then will follow a discussion of problems associated with external testing. Finally, various solutions that have been proposed will be discussed and evaluated.

In developing this paper, the attempt

was made to be inclusive rather than exclusive. There are included a number of "problems" which are not or should not be "problems." There are included several proposed solutions which, in my opinion, would not solve the problems of external testing or which might well create more serious problems than they solve. Thus, there was no attempt to editorialize or present a point of view in determining the points to be covered. On the other hand, this paper will not consist of a mere listing of facts, of problems associated with external testing, or of solutions that have been proposed. In most instances, an attempt has been made to add arguments for and/or against a particular point.

### THE EXTERNAL TESTING PROGRAMS

In order to discuss external testing adequately it is necessary to define what one means by external tests. External testing programs cannot be identified by the types of tests that are used. Any school may purchase for its own internal testing program tests that are similar to the ones used in external testing programs.

There is one organizational aspect of two of the external testing programs that sets them apart from internal programs. The College Board tests and the American College Testing Program are given under "secure" conditions. That is, there are a limited number of testing centers in a state, the test administrator is someone trained to administer standardized tests, the administrator and proctors are reimbursed for their efforts, and strenuous attempts are made to see that the test items used in these tests do not become available to anyone outside the sponsoring agencies.

\* For the past five years, the NCA Committee on Articulation of High Schools and Colleges has been studying the growing trends and problems in external testing (Vroman, Clyde, "First Report on External Testing," *THE NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION QUARTERLY*, January, 1961, pp. 223-225).

Dr. Womer, Assistant Professor of Education and Consultant, Bureau of School Services at the University of Michigan, presented "Pros and Cons of External Testing Programs" to the Conference on High School-College Articulation and The Role of Testing sponsored by the Michigan State NCA Committee at Ann Arbor, April 25-26, 1961. Copies of the Conference Report are available for 75¢ from the Bureau of School Services, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

Copies of the Articulation Committee's First and Second Reports on External Testing are available, without charge, from the Office of the Secretary, North Central Association, 5454 South Shore Drive, Chicago 15, Illinois.

The tests designed primarily for scholarship purposes, however, are not given in testing centers, but in each participating school. They are administered and procured by local school personnel. Of course, efforts are made to maintain the security of test items. But that job is difficult because of the thousands of separate testing units involved.

If external tests cannot be identified by the type of test being used, and only in part by the organization of the programs, how can they be identified? It seems to me that there are at least two distinctive features of the external testing programs: 1) the results of external tests are used primarily by some institution or organization other than the high school, and 2) the local school has or feels no real choice as to whether their students take these tests.

It is true that each of the publishers of the tests used in external testing programs have done many things to make scores from their tests usable by pupils, by counselors, by parents, and by school administrators. It is important to keep in mind, however, that if the College Board tests had been designed primarily for high school guidance purposes, they would not be the same tests they are today—these tests are designed to be used primarily by college personnel as part of the total body of information on which important decisions of selection, scholarships, and placement will be made. In like fashion the National Merit Scholarship Qualifying Test does not exist today because of any great hiatus of educational development tests at the high school level—a long form of the NMSQT (Iowa Tests of Educational Development) has been available for years to schools wishing to use it. The NMSQT came into being because a national scholarship agency wanted to have a common test score on all of its candidates.

The question of lack of free choice of taking these tests might be argued by some. Technically, no one is physically forcing students to take one test or another. Yet any bright, college-bound student who needs financial assistance

would be foolish not to take the National Merit test, and any student aspiring to entry into an institution requiring College Board Tests is hardly in a position to bargain.

By using the definition just outlined, at least four tests used in Michigan would qualify as external tests—the College Entrance Examinations Boards (CEEB), the American College Testing Program (ACT), the National Merit Scholarship Qualifying Test (NMSQT), and the Preliminary Scholastic Aptitude Test (PSAT). The first two of these are college entrance examinations, the latter two are primarily college scholarship tests. If one were to use some broader definition, other programs could be classified as being external.

Let us now look briefly at the types of tests that are included in the four instruments we have classified as external tests. Two of these tests are designed to measure scholastic aptitude—the SAT (Scholastic Aptitude Test) portion of the College Boards and the PSAT. In fact the PSAT is a short form of the SAT, using items from the same files. Both tests yield two scores—a linguistic-type ability score, and a numerical-type ability score. Both could be classified as intelligence tests.

One of the four test instruments measures achievement, if one defines achievement as the product of instruction in a specific class. The Achievement Tests of the College Boards include such tests as English Composition, Advanced Mathematics, Chemistry, French, and others.

Two of the four external testing programs measure educational development. The ACT and the MNSQT are both children of the well-known Iowa Tests of Educational Development, at least in philosophy if not in specific items. An educational development test falls some place between intelligence tests and achievement tests. Items are written that will reflect a pupil's proficiency on his entire educational history (both in school and out of school). Such tests do reflect instruction, but they also reflect general ability.



Thus, the ACT and NMSQT are designed to measure different things than the College Boards and PSAT.

#### USES OF EXTERNAL TESTING PROGRAMS

All four of these testing programs may be used to a greater or lesser degree for a variety of purposes. They can be used by high schools for counseling with college-bound students, for the results from any good standardized ability or achievement test taken by a high school student can be helpful in the guidance process.

All four of these tests can and are being used for selection purposes, for which they have at least one characteristic that sets them apart from similar high school level tests. The typical high school test is designed to help make judgments at all ability and achievement levels from very low to very high. Although a group intelligence test may yield IQ's from 50 to 150, half of all the actual IQ's achieved will fall between 90 and 110. An intelligence test author develops a few very easy test items to discriminate between students with IQ's of 60 and 70 and a few difficult items to discriminate between students with IQ's of 130 and 140. However, most of his items will be of average difficulty, designed to discriminate between IQ's of 90 and 110.

The most efficient tests designed specifically for college-bound students are those concentrating on the top half of the general population. Some studies have indicated that an average College Board score of 500 is approximately equivalent to a general IQ of about 120. This is the way it should be if the College Boards are to do the best possible job of helping to shed light on college potential. It doesn't matter whether the NMSQT differentiates accurately between percentiles of 45 and 50 as long as it differentiates between percentiles of 97 and 98.

At least one of the four external tests can be used for placement and/or acceleration purposes at the college level. The achievement portion of the College Boards is probably most amenable to such uses as they are most like end-of-course exami-

nations. The SAT, NMSQT, and ACT do not yield information of much help in placement in specific courses, although they could be helpful for selection for an honors program when an important basis for judgment is the students' scholastic ability to succeed in such a program.

#### PROBLEMS

Let us look at some problems that have been associated with external testing.

One of the complaints about external testing is that the pressures to participate are too great to be resisted and that these pressures have a detrimental effect. Publicity about the closing college door has tended to make some parents and pupils feel that participation in admissions and scholarship testing programs is inevitable and that a pupil's whole future rests on the resulting test scores. To say that such fears are entirely groundless is a refusal to face facts. To agree that they are entirely realistic fears is equally rash. Securing a \$1,000 a year scholarship may cause Johnny to decide to go to MIT rather than some college in Michigan. This may well make a difference in Johnny's life. But who can say whether such differences are good or bad? A refusal of admission to one college may result in the choice of another college. Who can say whether the education secured in the second-choice college is poorer than that in the first-choice college? In some instances the second-choice college may actually be a much better selection.

When the pressures on pupils and parents to attain high scores on external tests becomes extreme, perhaps the whole relationship between a school and its constituents needs to be re-examined carefully; perhaps a school's entire guidance and public relations programs need to be scrutinized. There are certainly pressures on schools from other external programs. Yet, most schools seem to be able to handle such pressures satisfactorily.

Another objection that some people raise to external testing programs is that too many pupils are taking the tests. Since only the top two percent nationally will

get past the first scholarship screening test (NMSQT), perhaps it would be wise to keep the number of students taking the test to a minimum. But some schools prefer to have all of their college-bound students take the tests, and others administer it to all of their juniors. When such conditions prevail, the external test ceases to be external, and as an internal test should no longer be subject to the criticisms leveled at external tests.

A third objection that has been raised is that too much student time is spent taking external tests. The NMSQT, the PSAT, and the ACT each take about a half day, and the complete College Boards take two half-days. Thus, the *maximum* time spent on these four tests would be the equivalent of two and one-half school days.

Most people probably would agree that students should not be expected to use up two days in testing unless some benefits will result. Considering that important decisions about college scholarships and college admissions are going to be influenced by these two days, it may be a small investment of time for the good that can result. It would be interesting to speculate as to how many days are spent by a typical college-bound student visiting various college campuses—in many instances it would be more than two days.

It is very possible, of course, that many school systems are doing more testing than is warranted. One would need to analyze internal as well as external testing to make a satisfactory judgment.

Some school administrators feel that they are required to spend too much of their time or that their counselors must spend too much time in signing up students for the various external tests, and in actually administering the scholarship tests. There can be no question that it does take administrative and/or counselor time to handle the external testing programs. It is also true that it takes some time to handle the administrative details of all student activities. Whether the administrative time spent on external testing is "too much" must be answered individually by each administrator; it

must be answered both in relation to the outcomes of external testing and in relation to his other administrative duties.

Another practical objection that is sometimes raised to external testing is that it costs too much money. NMSQT costs \$1.00; PSAT costs \$1.00; CEEB costs \$5.00 for SAT and \$8.00 for the achievement tests, and ACT costs \$3.00. This is a total of \$18.00 if all four tests are taken. This is a fair amount of money it's true. But consider for a moment how many schools pictures, name cards, and graduation announcements one can buy for \$18.00. Or consider what portion of the cost of a class ring could be covered for that amount of money. How much money is "too much" is a relative decision.

Another charge that has been made against external testing is that it has grown big because of a fight between two test publishers. It has been inferred that the publishers are more concerned with profits than with educational progress. It would be foolish to say that competition between test publishers does not exist—it does exist and many decisions relative to the marketing of tests are based upon such competition. To infer that such competition necessarily results in poor tests is not warranted; to infer that it sometimes results in duplication of testing is, in my opinion, true.

Both of the publishers involved in this discussion have promoted their scholarship tests as general guidance tools, valuable for all college-bound students at the very least. Yet, both tests were supposedly designed to help do the job of screening scholarship candidates. Proponents of wide use of the scholarship tests claim that it is entirely feasible for one test to be a good guidance tool at several ability levels, yet also be entirely adequate for scholarship screening. Others might challenge that point of view.

Lest I appear to be too negative on this point, it is well to keep in mind that the test publishers have not forced a half million students to take the NMSQT—many other people have been encouraging large groups of students to take the test. It also



is important to remember that competition appears in other areas—school textbooks are not produced by entirely disinterested authors or publishers. A good case might be made for defending competition on the basis of improved quality of product.

A major charge that is made against external testing is that it results in standardization of the school program, that it stifles experimentation, that it dictates teaching practices. There are at least three different ways to react to this point: 1) it happens and it is bad; 2) it happens and it is good; 3) it doesn't necessarily happen. Notice that the words "doesn't necessarily" are stressed. Persons taking this position would not say that it can't happen, but simply that it doesn't have to happen. They would feel that here, at least, is one aspect of the impact of external testing that is in part at the mercy of the local administrator. They would claim that through working with faculty, with parents, with counselors, and with students, it is possible to eliminate or minimize the effects of testing on the curriculum.

I have been told that some principals have had struggles with proponents of domineering music programs, that some have had struggles with downtown coaches, and so on. If these other pressures for domination of the school program can be held at bay, why, then, cannot domination of the curriculum via testing be controlled?

We really don't know how much effect, if any, external testing is having on high school education today. Some say that we already have the effect; others say we don't have it yet but it's coming; still others claim that it will never materialize.

Rather closely allied with the last point is the question of "coaching" for the external tests. The effect of coaching on test taking has been debated far and wide. The research evidence clearly indicates that coaching for intelligence tests very quickly reaches a point of diminishing returns. Research has demonstrated that practice on one ability test is as good as practice on

two or more tests, and that coaching classes actually produces less gain than a single practice test. On subject matter tests such as French or Biology, it would be odd indeed if coaching had no effect. Such a statement would mean that formal education has no effect on learning. I am sure that proficiency in any subject area is amenable to change via formal education.

Tests of educational development are probably susceptible to coaching, if coaching is done via regular classwork for an extended period of time. A short series of coaching sessions has very little effect. A student who has taken one or more educational development tests before taking the NMSQT probably has had as much coaching as he can profit from.

A common complaint that is directed primarily at college admissions tests is "Why are test scores needed for college admissions *now*? We got along without them perfectly well for a good many years." This statement implies that nothing has changed or should change in the educative process. Yet, education is continually changing. How many school administrators would care to admit that they are holding to all of the same practices that they held to 10 or 20 years ago? Would we refuse to use Language Laboratories or the new math curriculum just because we got along all right without them ten years ago?

These statements should not be taken to imply that the reverse is necessarily true—that a new practice is automatically a good practice. Using tests for college admissions is not a good practice because it is new; neither is it a bad practice because it is new.

Actually, it isn't new at all in many institutions. Some colleges and universities have been using the College Boards for 50 or 60 years—since the inception of the Board program. Those institutions are primarily ones which have had highly selective admissions for years. Today a great many colleges are becoming more selective than they have ever been before. As they become more selective, admissions officers are faced with decisions that re-



quire finer and finer discriminations. In order to maximize correct decisions and minimize incorrect ones, many colleges now feel that they cannot afford to ignore the type of information provided by test scores.

To some critics, if a college says that it wants to add test data to admissions files, this is taken to mean that it wants to replace all previously used criteria with a test score. At this point, logical reasoning certainly has broken down for such critics. I don't believe that a college admissions officer could ignore high school records and other pertinent data even if he wanted to, and I've never heard one say that he wanted to. I don't believe he could ignore these other criteria because I think he would make too many mistakes to keep his job very long.

Some critics have said yes, we can see that colleges need test scores and that scholarship agencies need test scores, but why can't they use the scores that are already available in our own school files? They argue that external tests merely duplicate scores already available.

This criticism calls for the exploration of several points. Earlier in this paper the different levels of difficulty at which tests may be aimed were mentioned. Tests such as the old ACE, the SCAT, or the new Kuhlmann-Anderson do yield linguistic and quantitative scores just as the SAT and the PSAT. However, high school tests are geared for all IQ levels, not just those in the upper half or upper third.

Achievement tests such as those in the Cooperative Test Series or the Evaluation and Adjustment Series are available for testing Algebra, Physics, World History, and other subject areas, but they are not at the level of difficulty of the achievement tests in the College Boards. They could hardly be used to help place college students in advanced sections.

This particular point about the differential level of difficulty of the external tests can not be made in reference to NMSQT. It is stated that the item difficulties for the NMSQT center about 50, which is no different from tests in general use.

Another point that needs to be dis-

cussed is uniformity of test administration and security precautions that generally are taken. It probably is impossible to design a testing program that cannot be tampered with if someone is determined enough to do it. However, it is probably true that the so-called "secure" testing programs, College Boards and ACT, do produce less variation in testing practices than any others and that the test items are less apt to fall into the hands of unauthorized personnel. It is also probably true that such programs as NMSQT and PSAT, while not as uniform or as secure as the first two, are nevertheless more uniformly administered and more secure than internal testing programs.

Suppose that the National Merit Scholarship Corporation were to say tomorrow, "Each high school principal should submit to us percentile ranks for his students from a general ability test, and all of these students with percentiles of 98 and 99 will be semifinalists." Would this be an acceptable procedure to school administrators? Would they really feel it fair to compare their own Otis percentile rank with a Kuhlmann-Finch given in Arkansas or a TEA given in Hawaii? Is it not possible that such a system could lead to temptations that would be too much for some people to resist? The same condition prevails in college admissions—are all internal testing programs really secure enough if a score is to be used as a part of a competitive selective process?

One major recommendation that has been made by some people is the establishment of equivalency tables. By this is meant a series of tables that would equate test scores for the various widely-used ability and achievement tests. This is certainly an appealing idea. It is an idea which I have favored for a number of years *for general guidance purposes*; it is an idea about which I have serious reservations if test results are to be used to any extent for selective or placement purposes.

The reservations are based on several points. First, there are the different difficulty levels of high school tests and tests designed for college-bound students.

Second, there is the lack of uniformity of test administration and security measures in high school testing. Third, there is the technical question of the reduced reliability of predicted test scores. A College Board score predicted from a DAT (Differential Aptitude Test) is not as reliable as an actual Board score. Fourth, and perhaps most important, the temptation to assume that all standardized tests are alike and that a score on one test is comparable to a score on any other similar test would be overwhelming. One difficulty with statistical treatment of test scores is that it is mathematically easy to equate things that logically should not be equated.

Another practical aspect to this question is the number of different tests now being used by schools for college counseling. In a recent study in Michigan, twenty-one different ability tests were reported in use. A rather extensive series of equivalency tables would have to be developed to relate all of these tests to College Boards and to NMSQT.

Still another criticism of external testing has been the comparisons of school systems that have been made. The selection of the so-called twenty best schools on the basis of number of National Merit Semifinalists ignores completely the ability level of the students enrolled in these schools. If one wanted to compare schools with any degree of fairness, it would be necessary to equate them on various factors, such as average IQ or socio-economic level of the community.

To say that such school-by-school comparisons are not reasonable, however, doesn't keep people from making them. Perhaps the only solutions to this criticism are either: 1) to eliminate the National Merit Scholarship program, or 2) to educate the public to a realistic appraisal of it. It's important to note that elimination of the NMSQT would not eliminate comparisons between schools. If scholarship candidates were chosen on any sort of merit basis, some schools would have more than others.

Some people have suggested that too much publicity has been given to the

semifinalists and winners in the National Merit program. Perhaps that is so; yet, students in our schools are honored for success in other aspects of the educational program. Somehow it would seem odd if the only solution to this problem of school-by-school comparison would be to make a secret operation out of the scholarship program.

At least one national authority has suggested that the double testing of National Merit candidates is unnecessary. He feels that the original screening of high school juniors could be done satisfactorily by the local school administrator. This could be done by allowing each principal to select two percent of his own juniors, or to allow him to select as many as he felt would qualify in the top two percent on a national basis. Either method would have certain shortcomings, but the practical difficulties could probably be handled. There is a real question, however, whether principals would really want the responsibility and burden associated with personally picking the students who would be eligible for national scholarships.

A final problem associated with external testing is one that has not been discussed very often. The problem is that the critics of external testing cannot agree upon what the "real" problems are. As this list of problems associated with external testing was being cited, most of you probably have been thinking to yourselves. "Yes, that is the one that is the real problem"; or "No, that one doesn't concern me."

For some the NMSQT and the PSAT are the external tests that irritate. For others, the College Boards are the tests at issue. For still others, the key point is that there are four of these tests.

#### PROPOSED SOLUTIONS

A number of different solutions have been proposed to meet the various criticisms that are aimed at external testing. Most of them seem to fall into one or the other of two rather broad categories.

*One category* of solutions, involving three alternatives, would call for a reduction in the number of programs.

1. The most extreme recommendation



in the first category would call for the elimination of all external testing programs. If such a step were undertaken, it would certainly result in a series of adjustments in scholarship selection and college admissions. One possible result could be that many, perhaps most, colleges would set up their own scholarship and admissions testing programs, and college applicants would be making treks around the state and the country taking tests wherever the colleges and universities of their choices are located.

2. A less extreme recommendation would call for the establishment of a single national testing program. It is difficult to visualize any test publisher's voluntarily withdrawing his own tests from the field. If there were to be a single national testing program, it probably would have to be a new program that would replace all four of the ones discussed here. This would mean that some new agency would have to be established to do the job—either governmental or educational. The details of such an effort would be many, but would not be unsolvable. Those critics who now question the effect of the present external testing programs on curriculum and instruction, might want to consider the potential effects of a single national testing program on a local school's curriculum. Others who object to a single national program claim that competition actually produces better tests and testing programs than a monopolistic effort would do.

3. A less extreme recommendation than either of the last two would call for a reduction of the number of external testing programs to two, rather than the elimination of all of them or replacement with a single national program. One rationale for this recommendation says that since there are basically two types of programs, let's have only two. The two types to which I am referring are the educational development type (NMSQT and ACT) and the separate intelligence and achievement type (College Boards and PSAT). If there were only NMSQT or ACT and if there were only College Boards or PSAT, the

present four programs would be reduced to two.

How could this be accomplished? It seems to me that it could be done only through the cooperative action of states or of regions. Looking at the NMSQT and the ACT, it would seem impossible at this time to stop using the NMSQT unless one is prepared to deny his students the right to compete for the national scholarships associated with it. Possibly the best way to eliminate one or the other of these two would be to convince colleges requiring ACT to accept NMSQT scores (since they are both developed by the same author and test essentially the same things) or to convince the National Merit Corporation to use the ACT results and drop the NMSQT. The latter suggestion may sound fanciful, but it has been proposed by responsible persons.

If one considers how to eliminate College Boards or PSAT, the problem is a bit different. The Boards have both the aptitude portion, SAT, and the achievement tests. The PSAT is simply another form of the SAT. To eliminate the College Boards one would have to convince a good many people that achievement tests have no place in college admissions or in college placement or acceleration. I would not care to be the one to take on that job. A much simpler alternative is not only open to school administrators, but it has already been done. The schools of one of the largest cities of the country do not administer the PSAT to their students. If it can be done in one city, perhaps it could be done all over the country.

A *second category*, consisting of eight possible solutions, does not attempt to alter or eliminate the programs, but rather to alleviate some or all of the problems associated with them.

1. One widely made suggestion calls for the establishment of equivalency tables so that a school could submit to the scholarship agencies or a college admissions officer a percentile rank or IQ from whatever test is being used in that school. This is certainly possible. Some of the objections have already been discussed



and will not be repeated here. However, I would like to mention what my reaction as a test consultant will be if this development takes place. If a high school principal is primarily concerned with giving his students the greatest possible test advantage in getting into the college of his choice, I would suggest that he settle on the intelligence test for his own internal testing program that yields the highest scores. If, on the other hand, a principal is primarily concerned with a student's getting into the college where he will be associating with others of like abilities and achievements, I would recommend that his student take whatever testing program is required by that college *in addition* to submitting all of the pertinent test scores from his own internal testing program.

2. One suggestion aimed at improving communication calls for more work with pupils and parents. In too many instances neither pupil nor parent knows what the various external tests are about or whether Johnny really should take them. Many of the fears built up in their minds could be reduced by proper information. Too often the impression is left that a scholarship or admissions decision depends wholly on the test score achieved on a particular day. It's no wonder that tensions grow when such impressions are allowed to go unchallenged. Test specialists have long advocated wide dissemination of information about tests and test scores. This applied both to internal and to external tests.

3. The suggestion has been made that all schools shift to Saturday administrations of the various external tests. Many schools already do test on Saturdays. For the school administrator who feels that time spent in testing is time lost from education, Saturday testing is a logical choice. For the school that incorporates any external test into its own testing program, a week day may be more appropriate. It is questionable whether complete agreement could be reached that schools should test on any particular day of the week.

4. Still another suggestion calls for re-

ducing the publicity associated with becoming a scholarship semifinalist or winner. It is claimed that the greater the publicity, the greater the competition and resulting ill effects. It is also claimed that wide publicity leads to unfair comparisons between schools. Here is an area in which school administrators might be able to establish some policies to govern news releases, if agreement can be reached as to the best course of action. Here, certainly, is an area in which a state or regional association could have an impact. Here, too, is an area in which each high school principal must share some of the responsibility for the effects of external testing.

5. One suggestion for alleviation of the effects of external testing is the holding of appropriate conferences. Their purpose would be to share ideas, to clarify points that may be vague, and to discuss whether some cooperative action should be taken by secondary school and college personnel. There is reason to believe that this approach to the problems presented by external testing and college articulation can be an effective one.

6. One of the aspects of national scholarship testing is the large numbers of students taking the exams (some half million). Yet approximately 1000 national scholarships are actually awarded each year. To screen a half million students to find 1000 is hardly necessary from the selection point of view. One large city in a North Central state allows only the top ten percent of its students to take the NMSQT. Their research indicated that their own winners never came from below the top ten percent; so they recently instituted this policy. One way that criticism involving numbers could be met, is by discouraging large numbers of students from taking the tests. Again, it's not certain that everyone would agree that such restrictions would be wise. In fact, it's possible that a majority might feel otherwise. Nevertheless, this is a potential solution to one of the criticisms aimed at external testing.

7. Another practical suggestion that has been made is for schools to take a

strong stand against "coaching" for the external tests. One of the major criticisms of external testing is that it influences curriculum, and that teachers will teach for the tests. Is it not possible for such practices to be controlled by high school principles? A strong stand by educators against "coaching" for tests in any form, along with the active cooperation of all school administrators could certainly hold coaching to a minimum. It would be foolish to imply that it can be eliminated since coaching books are available at bookstores. But, it certainly could be discouraged by an active campaign that includes working with students and parents.

8. Finally, there is one more practical suggestion, relating to the College Boards only, that has been made by members of the Board staff. It has been suggested that the College Board administration schedule be altered somewhat. First, it was suggested that the SAT portion of the Boards be administered at about the time school is adjourned in June of the student's junior year. This would eliminate some of the practical objections to giving it through the school year. It would provide the SAT scores to colleges earlier than they are now available, and would tend to eliminate any need for PSAT. The SAT score, then, would be used as a part of the college admissions process.

The second aspect of this suggestion calls for administering the Achievement Tests of the College Board at about the time school is adjourned in June of the senior year. The achievement test results would be available in time to be used for guidance and placement purposes in colleges but would not be available for the admissions process. It seems to me that this suggestion has considerable merit.

#### SOME OBSERVATIONS

In closing, I would like to make some personal observations. I have attempted to approach this whole topic of external testing in as objective a manner as possi-

ble. I sincerely feel that we now find ourselves in an uncomfortable position in relation to external testing because of conditions that are beyond the specific control of any one person. However, I also believe that our position is somewhat more uncomfortable than it needs to be and that each of us must share some of the responsibility for this condition and for future developments in this area.

I believe that test specialists have contributed to the lack of understanding in this area because of their failure to sell educational testing to educators and to the public as a vital part of the educative process. They have not convinced all educators that testing makes a unique contribution to the solution of many educational problems.

I believe that college faculties have created some misunderstanding in the use of test scores for admission to college because of their great concern with academic prestige, and their feeling that highly selective admissions policies are the royal road to that goal.

I believe that test publishers have magnified the problem because of their exploitation of the special purpose scholarship and admissions tests, and their promotion of these tests into overly-expanded national programs.

I believe that high school administrators have been overly sensitive to centralized control of testing due to their overzealous guarding of local autonomy, and their feeling that any program imposed from outside is automatically a bad one.

Lest I close on a negative note, I must hasten to add that I am very much impressed by the fact that test specialists, college personnel, and high school administrators can gather together to discuss what can be done to help solve or alleviate the problems of external testing and college articulation that are facing us. The starting point for any solution must be a mutual understanding of the problems of external testing as seen by everyone concerned with the improvement of secondary and college education.

# Two Studies on In-Service Education of College Instructors

## I. ORIENTING NEW FACULTY MEMBERS IN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

NORBERT J. TRACY, S.J.

In cooperation with an Advisory Graduate Committee  
University of Minnesota

## II. PROBLEMS OF NEW FACULTY MEMBERS IN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

HARLAN R. MCCALL

In association with Center for Study of Higher Education  
Michigan State University



THESE STUDIES WERE  
CONDUCTED AND REPORTED BY

The Subcommittee on In-Service Education of Teachers:

PAUL W. HARNLY (Chairman), Assistant Superintendent in charge of Secondary Education, Wichita Public Schools, Wichita, Kansas

Frank S. Endicott, Director of Placement and Professor of Education, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois

Eric H. Johnson, Administrative Assistant to the President, Illinois State Normal University, Normal, Illinois

Nicholas Schreiber, Principal, Ann Arbor High School, Ann Arbor, Michigan

W. Fred Totten, Director Graduate Study, Eastern Michigan University and Flint Board of Education, Flint, Michigan

Richard Stauffer, Principal, Horton Watkins High School, City of Ladue, St. Louis, Missouri

COMMITTEE ON TEACHER EDUCATION

COMMISSION ON RESEARCH AND SERVICE

NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND  
SECONDARY SCHOOLS

## Foreword

THE RAPID EXPANSION of enrollments in colleges and universities is necessitating the adding of many new and frequently inexperienced instructors. College deans and other administrators are finding many problems of orientation and induction of such new instructors. The interest shown in these studies has indicated the importance of the problems and the need to secure more information.

These studies are the first two of a series designed to locate the most pressing problems met by new faculty members and to ascertain the administrative procedures which have proved to be most helpful. It is hoped that this exchange of ideas and suggestions will be of value to deans, department heads, and others responsible for college instruction.

The committee learned about the first study, "Orienting New Faculty Members in Colleges and Universities," after it had been planned as a doctoral study by Norbert J. Tracy, S.J., at the University of Minnesota. It appeared that the findings of this study were likely to provide basic data related to the planned program of this committee. The committee, therefore, gave its support in the circulation of the questionnaire and requested the cooperation of the North Central Association schools in answering the questionnaire and in assisting Rev. Tracy in his personal visits to the sixteen member institutions. Rev. Tracy made an oral report of preliminary findings at the 1960 Annual Meeting and has prepared the manuscript as published in the *QUARTERLY*.

The study by Harlan R. McCall, "Problems of New Faculty Members in Colleges and Universities," was planned from the beginning with the subcommittee. It also was made as a doctoral study

in cooperation with the Center for the Study of Higher Education of Michigan State University. Professor McCall prepared the instruments, assembled the returns, tabulated the data, and wrote the final report.

The Center for the Study of Higher Education of Michigan State University has been of great assistance in planning the questionnaire, processing the data, and mimeographing the preliminary report. This preliminary report was presented before a discussion meeting of some 75 representatives of colleges and universities at the Annual Meeting of the North Central Association in Chicago, March 22, 1961.

The Graduate Committee advisers to Norbert J. Tracy, S.J. at the University of Minnesota were Dr. Ruth Eckert and Dr. Horace T. Morse.

The Graduate Committee for the Center for the Study of Higher Education, Michigan State University, included Dr. John X. Jamrich, Director, and Dr. Karl T. Hereford.

Because these studies concern higher institutions, the subcommittee has planned these programs in cooperation with the Commission on Colleges and Universities of the North Central Association. The third in this series, "A Study of the Effectiveness of the College Faculty Internship Program," is now in progress.

Reprints of this report are available from Office of the Secretary, North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, 5454 South Shore Drive, Chicago 15, Illinois. Price: single copies, 25 cents; quantities of ten or more, 15 cents.

PAUL W. HARNLY, Chairman  
Subcommittee on In-Service  
Education of Teachers

# Orienting New Faculty Members in Colleges and Universities

COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY administrators are investing more time and money every year in faculty recruitment in order to meet soaring enrollments in the midst of a teacher shortage. A concurrent problem of which they are becoming increasingly aware is the need to help new faculty members understand the purposes and policies of their expanding institutions, and their own roles as teachers. Many college and university administrators also recognize that inexperienced teachers particularly need systematic orientation and assistance with problems of teaching and related professional services. Yet little has been done in higher education to determine which orientation practices are particularly effective.

A recent study at the University of Minnesota<sup>1</sup> was designed (1) to learn about what is being done to orient new faculty members in colleges and universities; (2) to discover how helpful the administrators and new faculty members perceive these orientation practices to be; and (3) to find out what suggestions new faculty members have for improving orientation procedures.

## SCOPE AND METHOD OF THE STUDY

The deans of 97 percent of the 345 accredited, four-year, liberal arts programs in the North Central Association completed a four-page, printed questionnaire on which they identified and appraised orientation practices in their institutions. A stratified random sample of twelve colleges was then selected from among the

336 participating institutions which maintained an average or better comprehensive program of faculty orientation. Four Jesuit colleges from the area were also added.

Interviews were held with a total of 231 faculty members in these 16 institutions: 101 new faculty members, 81 experienced teachers, and 49 department chairmen. Faculty participants, usually selected by random sampling, identified and appraised orientation practices, assessed problems of incoming faculty, and suggested ways to improve orientation programs.

Various hypotheses, involving responses of groups of participants, were tested to throw light on two questions: Would practices and appraisals of orientation practices vary significantly by size of institution (large or small), type of control (public or private), or the manner in which faculty orientation is planned and conducted (by administrators alone, or by administrators and a faculty committee)? Would attitudes toward orientation vary significantly among the three groups of interviewees, and between subgroups of beginning teachers and experienced newcomers among the new faculty members?

Selected findings are presented in this article.<sup>2</sup>

## ADMINISTRATION OF ORIENTATION

Major responsibilities for the orientation of new faculty members were mainly vested in administrative officers—the dean of the college or university (in 85 percent of the institutions), the chairman

<sup>1</sup> Norbert J. Tracy, S.J., "Orientation of New Faculty Members in North Central Colleges and Universities." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, 1961. 351 pp.

<sup>2</sup> Complete data about the various analyses of responses between groups are presented in the dissertation and in its 40 statistical tables.



f the department (in 72 percent), and the resident of the college (in 46 percent). Others sharing in this responsibility (in even to fifteen percent of the institutions) were: a faculty member, a business officer, division chairman, and an associate or assistant dean.

In about a third of the colleges, faculty committees played some role in planning and administering the orientation program. The names of such committees varied but included Faculty Affairs Committee or Personnel Committee; Faculty Fall Conference Committee or Workshop Committee; Academic Affairs, or Curriculum, or Improvement of Instruction Committee; Faculty Orientation Committee; Administrative Committee; Ad Hoc Committee, the Faculty Council; and various combinations of faculty and administrative officers. Some committees consisted of administrative officers alone. A contrasting practice in one institution was described thus:

No administrative personnel are on the committee. The committee consists of three instructional staff who have been here many years, two who have been here two years, and two who have been here one year. Each year the two new faculty members who have been on the committee two years are dropped.

Such faculty committees were reported in 40 percent of the public institutions, in 30 percent of the church-related colleges, and in 20 percent of the private, non-sectarian colleges.

#### CURRENT ORIENTATION PRACTICES

Practically all the institutions provided some faculty orientation, about half of them having established special orientation procedures during postwar expansion.

Roughly ninety percent or more of the institutions followed these five practices, listed in the order of frequency:

- "Open door" policy for conferences between new faculty members and chief administrators;
- Assistance in securing housing;
- Visit to the campus for interviews prior to signing a contract;
- Social affairs (college-wide or departmental to assist new faculty in meeting staff)
- Tour of campus facilities.

One-half to three-fourths of the colleges followed five other practices:

- Information furnished regarding local community recreation, educational opportunities for children, etc.;
- Faculty handbook given each new staff member;
- Reception into faculty club(s);
- Institute (conference, workshop) for entire faculty before the fall term;
- Special meeting(s) for new faculty members *before* the opening of the fall term.

The remaining three practices studied were reported in 15 to 33 percent of the colleges:

- Light teaching load during the first term;
- Special meeting(s) for new faculty members *during* the fall term;
- Each new teacher assigned a faculty member (other than the department chairman) to serve as host and counselor.

Analysis of these data showed that institutional size and control seemed to be related to some orientation procedures. Among the significant findings:<sup>1</sup> small, private institutions more often convened an all-faculty orientation meeting before the fall term, and gave newcomers a light teaching load during the first term. Public institutions were more likely to provide orientation meetings for new faculty members during the fall term.

More detail on some of these practices may be helpful. The following comments are based on remarks of respondents or on analysis of the practices found.

The all-faculty institute, conference, or workshop, held before the opening of the fall term in 58 percent of the institutions, typically lasted for two or two and a half days. These conferences usually treated such topics as institutional objectives and philosophy of education, the improvement of instruction, curriculum changes, and the counseling of students.

The primary stated purpose of this fall conference was to orient the entire faculty to the coming academic year. The same

<sup>1</sup> "Significant" differences between groups were determined by statistical tests utilizing the stringent one percent level of confidence. Lesser differences reported between groups meet at least the five percent level of confidence (indicating that chance alone might account for these five percent of the time).

practice existed in a few large departments within large institutions. New faculty members were usually invited to these meetings and in some instances were required to attend.

Other special meetings for new faculty members were held *before* the fall term (in 53 percent of the colleges). According to the deans' reports, these special topics were treated to introduce new faculty members to local policies which were well known to older faculty on the campus: objectives of the college, philosophy of education, and special college traditions; faculty personnel policies and welfare benefits; and administrative procedures, regulations, and faculty duties.

Special meetings for new faculty members *during* the fall term (held in 30 percent of the colleges) seemed to be of two types. One type involved college-wide meetings of all new faculty to orient them to college administrative procedures and personnel policies, to give them an opportunity to ask questions after a couple weeks of campus experience, to provide talks by senior faculty (perhaps two or three a semester), and to promote discussions on the improvement of teaching or other topics. The second type of meeting consisted of regular or weekly departmental seminars designed more for inservice assistance than for orientation. The topics discussed included methods of teaching in the field, grading policies, and the coordination of multiple-section courses or of laboratory and lecture combinations.

A faculty handbook or manual of personnel policies and faculty directives was provided newcomers in roughly three-fourths of the North Central institutions. Although one quarter of the colleges did not have a handbook, most of them distributed mimeographed information about personnel policies and welfare benefits. The consensus seemed to be that the faculty handbook was difficult to keep up to date; however, some institutions reported committees assigned to develop or revise the handbook. Most handbooks were loose-leaf to facilitate the insertion

of revised pages. A few administrators said that handbooks were mailed to new faculty members before arrival on campus. Some deans held a special meeting for new faculty members to brief them on pertinent sections of the handbook.

A senior colleague (other than the department chairman) was assigned to serve as host and counselor to a new faculty member in relatively few institutions (15 percent of the colleges in the study). Some administrators indicated that this was done only in selected departments, and then quite informally. In large institutions with multiple-section freshman courses, special counseling was often given new teachers by the supervisor.

Social affairs to assist new faculty members in meeting others on the staff were reported in 92 percent of the colleges and seemed to be centered strongly in the departments. Printed programs of orientation and personal comments revealed various kinds of social gatherings: free informal luncheons, cocktail hours, soirees, teas, and dinners. Two respondents mentioned social affairs at which new faculty met leading citizens of the community. Most meetings seemed to be for new faculty members and their spouses, and in some institutions a social gathering of this nature was used to explain to husbands and wives the benefits and privileges of the new faculty members. Some get-togethers were on-campus and some at "retreat" facilities or at the dean's or the president's home.

Assistance in securing housing sometimes included providing a list of vacancies, personally house-hunting with newcomers, or having the Faculty Wives' Club or the business office help in various ways.

Some colleges and universities highlighted the attractive features of their local communities or their urban facilities through materials mailed to prospective teachers. In some institutions the president of the Faculty Wives' Club wrote a letter welcoming new families and helping to orient them to the community and campus activities.



#### EFFECTIVENESS OF A FACULTY COMMITTEE'S ASSISTANCE

The present study indicated that a faculty committee can be very effective in aiding administrators in the orientation of new faculty members. Significantly greater percentages of deans who were working with such a committee, as compared with deans who were working without such a committee, reported the following practices:

Provision of information about the local community.  
Faculty handbook given each new faculty member.  
All faculty institute conference/workshop before the fall term.

Greater (but not significantly larger) percentages of deans working with such a committee identified the following practices:

Reception into faculty club(s).  
Special meeting(s) for new faculty before the fall term.  
Special meeting(s) for new faculty during the fall term.  
Each new teacher assigned a faculty member (other than the department head) to serve as host and counselor.

The development of a broad program of attention to faculty service evidently takes the imagination and initiative of both the dean and a faculty orientation committee. Since the seven practices used are characteristic of institutions having such faculty committees, these administrators seem to endorse the idea of enlisting the assistance of faculty committees to serve the needs of new faculty members in their particular institutions, and to plan, carry out, and evaluate the orientation program.

#### ADMINISTRATORS' APPRAISALS OF PRACTICES

Orientation practices which deans identified as "clearly" or "extremely" helpful to new faculty members, and which were widely used in a majority of the participating North Central colleges and universities, were beginning with the practices appraised highest.

Visit to the campus for interviews prior to signing a contract.

All faculty institute conference/workshop before the fall term.

Special meeting(s) for new faculty before the opening of fall term.

Faculty handbook given each new faculty member.  
"Open door" policy for conferences between new-comers and their administrators.

Assistance in securing housing.

Tour of campus facilities.

Orientation practices which were likewise appraised highly but were less widely used (in 15 to 33 percent of the colleges studied) were:

Special meeting(s) for new faculty during the fall term.

Each new teacher assigned a faculty member (other than the department chairman) as host and counselor.

Lighten teaching load during the first term.

Three orientation practices were widely used but were appraised as only "slightly helpful" to new faculty members. These were:

Local affairs (college-wide or departmental) to assist new faculty in meeting staff.  
Information furnished about the local community.  
Reception into faculty club(s).

Deans who identified practices actually used in their institutions, appraised 10 of these 13 practices significantly more favorably than did those deans who appraised how helpful the practices might have been if begun in their institutions. These differences, no doubt, reflected the successful experience with the practices in the first group and a lack of experience in the latter group. In other words, administrators generally do not realize how helpful certain orientation practices can be until they try them.

Deans having the assistance of a faculty committee appraised most of their orientation practices significantly more favorably than did deans who administered the orientation program alone. A significant difference also appeared between those two groups (and in the same direction) when the deans appraised their orientation process as a whole, regardless of whether they considered their orientation of



new faculty members to be "informal" or "systematic." This underscores the value of a faculty committee.

NEW FACULTY MEMBERS'  
REPORT ON PRACTICES

The 101 new faculty members who were interviewed in 16 institutions and the 336 administrators who participated in the first phase of this study, tended to agree in their identification of existing orientation practices in their own institutions.

For a few orientation practices, however, there was considerable difference in response between the two groups. The deans, for example, often referred to the availability of a service, such as the provision of housing assistance and information about the local community; whereas the new faculty members referred more frequently to information and aid actually offered to them. Illustrative of this, practically all administrators (97 percent) affirmed the presence of an "open door" policy for faculty conferences, whereas less than two-thirds of the new faculty members (61 percent) were aware of such a policy. It might be suggested, therefore, that better communication about the availability of such information and aid could improve the orientation process.

When responses of the 101 new faculty members were compared to the responses of their own deans in the 16 institutions visited, findings were generally similar to those reported above, with two exceptions. Considerably fewer new faculty members reported provision of a faculty handbook and a tour of campus facilities. Evidently in these cases the newcomer did not get a handbook or a tour of the facilities. These practices may not have been provided that particular year or the new faculty member may not have been present when the handbooks were distributed or the tour was taken.

NEW FACULTY MEMBERS'  
APPRAISALS OF PRACTICES

When new faculty members evaluated the helpfulness of current practices to them personally, they generally rated

four practices as "clearly" or "extremely" helpful:

- Lightened teaching load during the first term,
- Assistance in securing housing,
- Visit to the campus for interviews prior to signing a contract,
- Special meeting(s) for new faculty *before* the opening of the fall term.

The average appraisal given the other nine practices was "slightly helpful."

Comments by new faculty members threw interesting light on their orientation problems. Two out of every five of the new faculty interviewees had had a lightened teaching load during the first term and were especially appreciative of this adjustment.

Housing assistance was welcomed particularly by new faculty members in the sciences and in the fine arts who were concerned about quarters close enough to the campus so they could easily do evening work. Other newcomers remarked that assistance in locating housing eased the pressure descending on them when they were anxious to get settled with their families and prepare for top performance in their positions.

A pre-contract visit to the campus for interviews was a deciding factor for a recruit from industry: "Without this invitation I doubt that my interest would have been sufficiently aroused to consider seriously the possibility of a teaching position." General group comment was that the visit had helped to assure the new faculty member that he was making the right decision in joining the staff.

Especially noteworthy are two comments about a special meeting for new faculty members before fall classes:

Extremely helpful! Yes, even though I came with experience, the three days of orientation meetings were not too much. Actually, they took up only two or three hours each day. (large university) Very helpful because I got a more thorough knowledge of the institution, the records and reports, insurance policies, and so on. You read these in the orientation handbook, but you don't get their full significance. (small college)

Comments supporting the lower appraisals of the remaining nine practices

generally indicated that many problems which new faculty members encountered during their first term or year at the institution could be remedied by improved orientation practices.

- In the orientation meeting a lot of matters were hurried over in a short time.
- The all-faculty meeting *before* the fall term began dealt with campus problems and politics about which I was not concerned.
- The faculty handbook is phrased in only vague terms and offers only minimal amounts of information.
- There are too many social gatherings at which the newcomer's presence is expected just when he is extremely busy preparing courses.

#### NEW FACULTY MEMBERS' APPRAISALS OF INFORMATION PROVIDED

All participants in the study also indicated the information about the institution which was supplied to them within the first couple of months on the faculty. From a list of 18 items of information, new faculty members specified information they actually received and the source of the information. All other participants specified the information usually given and the particular channel of communication.

Three sources of institutional information were reported as "especially helpful":

- A meeting held for all new faculty members (before or during the fall term),
- Contacts with experienced teachers,
- A personal conference with the department chairman.

The information which new faculty members indicated they received from these three sources may be itemized as follows:

- Meeting for all new faculty members:
  - Faculty personnel policies and welfare benefits,
  - College's educational goals and current problems in reaching objectives,
  - Structure and scope of the curriculum;
- Contacts with experienced teachers:
  - Grading practices and records to be kept,
  - Objectives and content of their courses,
  - Assistance available in preparing instructional materials;
- Conference with the department chairman:
  - College's educational goals and current problems in reaching objectives,

Objectives and curriculum of the department,  
Objectives and content of their courses.

These sources contrasted with the four chief channels of communication on which the deans relied, namely, a conference with an administrative officer, a department meeting, a faculty handbook, and a meeting for new faculty members. Only the last of these four practices was singled out for high appraisal by new faculty members. Some of them stated that department meetings were not particularly helpful in their institutions because some senior faculty do not feel the need for a department meeting; thus, meetings are not held, or not until late in the term. Many new faculty members considered the faculty handbook to be only "slightly helpful," that is, "better than nothing," but needing much improvement.

#### WHAT INCOMING FACULTY WANT TO KNOW FIRST ABOUT THEIR INSTITUTIONS

After each new teacher had evaluated the helpfulness of the 18 types of information which might have been given to him during his first month or two on campus, he was asked to choose the six topics about which he had particularly wanted information when he began teaching at his present college. The chief interests of the new faculty members from large and small institutions are shown in the following table.

Further analyses of these data according to the interests of "experienced" incoming faculty (those having approximately three years of college teaching) and those just beginning to teach in college revealed that experienced newcomers were significantly more concerned about the faculty's share in policy-making than were beginning teachers.

It was also evident that the size of the college affected somewhat the kinds of information that newcomers desire. For example, new faculty in small colleges were more interested in student personnel services and discipline procedures and in the extent of faculty participation in policy-making. Newcomers at large col-

## WHAT INCOMING FACULTY WANT TO KNOW FIRST

Kinds of Information Wanted (Ranked according to frequency of choice by all new faculty in small colleges)	New Staff Wanting This Information <sup>a</sup>	
	Small <sup>b</sup> colleges (N=44 new teachers)	Large <sup>b</sup> colleges (N=57 new teachers)
	Percent	Percent
Objectives and curriculum of their department or division (Humanities, Natural or Social Sciences) . . . . .	66	63
Objectives and content of the courses which they were to teach . . . . .	55	56
College educational goals and current problems in meeting them . . . . .	52	42
Faculty load (duties in teaching, counseling, other services) . . . . .	52	75*
Types of students enrolled in the college . . . . .	43	40
Extent of faculty participation in policy-making . . . . .	43*	26
Over-all structure and scope of the college's curriculum . . . . .	36	37
Assistance available in preparing instructional materials . . . . .	32	32
Grading practices and records to be kept . . . . .	30	28
Student personnel services and discipline procedures . . . . .	30**	9
Business procedures affecting faculty members . . . . .	27	28
Methods of improving instruction, experimenting, etc. . . . .	23	35
Personnel policies and welfare benefits for faculty . . . . .	23	42*
Methods of evaluating student learning . . . . .	20	14
Organization of faculty committees . . . . .	16	7
Student activities and organizations . . . . .	14	4
Purposes of lower-upper (junior-senior) divisions . . . . .	10	11
Organization and duties of college officials . . . . .	5	6

<sup>a</sup> Differences between newcomers to small and large colleges, which are significant at the five percent (\*) and one percent (\*\*) levels.

<sup>b</sup> Large colleges had 100 or more full-time teachers; small colleges had fewer than 100 full-time teachers.

leges, on the other hand, showed relatively greater interest in faculty load and in faculty personnel policies and welfare benefits.

An interesting overall conclusion is that most new faculty members want to know the objectives of their department, of their courses, and of the college itself. In small colleges such knowledge takes precedence apparently over information about faculty load, whereas in large institutions faculty load ranked highest among the items on which information was sought.

#### SATISFACTIONS AND DISSATISFACTIONS EARLY IN EMPLOYMENT

Satisfactions which new faculty members expressed about their orientation often centered around good human relations, "the attention given by the department chairman and others," friendly cooperation which made one "feel important," and the special orientation proce-

dures which were well-organized and very helpful.

The chief difficulties and dissatisfactions felt by new faculty members during their first few months at the institution involved the newcomer's role as teacher (two-thirds of all the difficulties mentioned). The new faculty members often lacked sufficient information about their work and lacked facilities and services; while teaching duties changed unpredictably. Many new faculty members also complained about a lack of departmental orientation.

Illustrative of some of the problems which a new faculty member can experience are the two following:

Having a senior faculty member assigned to assist me would have helped very much . . . someone would have explained how my courses had been taught in the past. I had no experience in teaching this type of introductory course and I was not aware of the particular goals of the department regarding this introductory course.



When I came this last fall, they were remodeling the science laboratory. Chemicals and equipment were disorganized and stored temporarily in all kinds of corners. I was supposed to be doing research besides teaching. No one showed me where I could locate the kinds of materials I wanted. I came with a lot of experience but had to waste a lot of time, delaying my research, because no one seemed interested in my needs.

The problems and dissatisfactions were mentioned in about equal numbers by beginning teachers and by experienced newcomers. One exception was that heavy work loads and lack of information about course objectives were mentioned mostly by beginning teachers.

#### SELECTED FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

A program to familiarize new faculty members with institutional goals and policies often is the initial stage of a program for professional growth of the faculty. Orientation begins in the hiring process and should be continued throughout the year, not deluging the newcomer with too much too fast, but as far as possible anticipating problems and needs of new faculty members.

In addition to the data already discussed, the following findings may be noted:

More and more institutions, especially in the last two decades, have been seriously studying and providing for the orientation of new faculty members.

All participants in the study agreed that almost all current orientation procedures are helpful to new faculty members, or could be if improved.

Although new faculty members and senior colleagues generally agreed, they differed significantly in how helpful some current orientation practices were, notably all-faculty orientation meetings and faculty handbooks. Deans, department chairmen and experienced teachers perceived greater helpfulness in these practices than new faculty acknowledged.

New faculty in large colleges appraised most practices "clearly helpful," whereas those in small colleges rated most as only "slightly helpful." Four significantly higher appraisals in large colleges concerned meetings of newcomers *during* the fall term, such meetings *before* the fall term, a campus visit for interviews *before* hiring, and social affairs to get acquainted.

Three conclusions may be drawn from the study:

Although many institutions provide numerous helps to new faculty, only a few well-defined orientation programs seem to exist. The number of these will increase with the need to protect the investment involved in attracting young, high-level talent to the faculty.

Faculty committees can effectively assist in planning, conducting, and evaluating an orientation program for new faculty members.

Most new faculty members want carefully planned orientation to institutional goals and policies. They need assistance pertinent to their special needs, and feel that present programs can be improved considerably along these lines.

# Problems of New Faculty Members in Colleges and Universities

## INTRODUCTION

AS FACULTY MEMBERSHIP increases, college and university administrators become more aware of the assistance they can give new faculty members in resolving the problems they face. Various types of orientation and in-service education programs have been employed by administrators in this effort. Frequently, they have proved *not* to be effective.

A new member of a faculty may be keenly aware of matters that he perceives to be "problems," but these may not be the same as the problems a college administrator would believe him to have. The new faculty member's perceptions depend upon his own needs, values, and aspirations. An orientation or in-service program can be effective *for him* only to the extent that it treats adequately those matters that *he* perceives to constitute problems. Therefore, a first step in the design for improving orientation and in-service programs is to identify the problems that new faculty members perceive as troublesome and the administrative practices that new faculty members find genuinely helpful in resolving those problems.

In-service programs take on special importance in the light of present and anticipated increases in the number of faculty members. Estimates place the need for additional college faculty members during the next decade at an average of about 34,000 per year. Effective in-service programs obviously would be extremely helpful in assimilating these new members into faculty ranks and in ena-

bling them to make optimum contributions early in their careers.

Considerable literature is available in which administrators express their views of problems that beset new faculty members and describe the administrative devices employed to help resolve such problems. However, few studies have attempted to learn just what problems new faculty members perceive or just how new faculty members evaluate administrative practices designed to help them resolve problems.

## PURPOSES OF THE STUDY

This study dealt with two principal questions: (1) What problems did new faculty members indicate that they encountered in their college and university teaching positions? and (2) Which administrative procedures did new faculty members perceive to be helpful in alleviating those problems? New faculty members were considered to be those full-time members of the staff who spend more than half-time as teachers and who were employed for the first time by these institutions whether or not they have had previous teaching experience in other institutions.

Information received via questionnaire from new faculty members in all NCA member institutions included in the survey was analyzed for purposes of identifying:

1. The problems perceived most frequently by new faculty members.
2. The problems that caused the greatest degree of difficulty.

Information received from those institutions of less than 3,000 enrollment was analyzed further for the following

\* Dr. McCall is head of the Education Department at Alma College, Alma, Michigan.—EDITOR

purposes:

1. To identify the problems that were most persistent, that is, that tended to remain unresolved.
2. To determine the extent to which the problems perceived by new faculty members were (a) personal problems related to housing, social relations, etc., (b) *institutional* problems related to curriculum, objectives, facilities, etc., or (c) *instructional* problems related to teaching techniques, selection of instructional materials, etc.
3. To determine if there were significant differences in the critical problems perceived by new faculty members that were related to the personal factors of sex, age, level of academic preparation, or previous professional experience.
4. To determine if there were significant differences in the critical problems perceived by new faculty members that were related to the institutional factors of (a) size, as measured by enrollment, (b) nature of control, public or private, and (c) level of instruction for which institutions are accredited, undergraduate or graduate.
5. To determine the effectiveness, as perceived by new faculty members, of practices that were used extensively by college and university administrators to help the faculty members resolve their problems, and to estimate the effectiveness, as judged by new faculty members, of practices that might be so used.
6. To formulate, by implication, suggestions for the improvement of programs of orientation and in-service education of new faculty members in colleges and universities.

#### SOURCE OF DATA

A four-page questionnaire was mailed to 2,747 individuals in 164 North Central Association member colleges and universities near the end of the 1959-60 college year. This number, 2,747, represented all first- and third-year faculty members from slightly more than half of the NCA institutions of less than 3,000 enrollment and a smaller sample of first- and third-year faculty members from institutions of 3,000 and more. There were 1,552 usable questionnaires received, representing 56.6 percent of the initial mailing.

Institutions were divided on the basis of size: small—under 1,000 enrollment; large—1,000 to 2,000; and extra-large—over 3,000. Two mailings to individuals in the 144 institutions of less than 3,000 enrollment brought a 65.7 percent response.

Only one mailing was made to individuals in the 20 extra-large institutions; 42.5 percent of this group responded.

#### CHARACTERISTICS OF INSTITUTIONS REPRESENTED

For inclusion in this study, a stratified random sample was selected from among the North Central Association membership of July 1, 1959.<sup>1</sup> For institutions of less than 3,000 enrollment, three bases of classifications were utilized: (1) size, as reflected in enrollments; (2) nature of control (public or private); and (3) the highest level of instruction for which each institution was accredited (graduate or undergraduate). NCA institutions are classified according to these three criteria in Table 1, which indicates the total NCA membership and, for each category, the number of institutions included in this study.

Extra-large institutions, over 3,000 enrollment, were treated as one group for drawing the sample instead of being classified further by *control* and *level of NCA approval* as was done in the small and large institutions. There were 79 of the extra-large institutions; a sample of first- and third-year faculty members from 20 randomly selected institutions in this classification was used in this study. Responses from new faculty members in these institutions were analyzed for identification of critical problems but no attempt was made to analyze the critical problems for institutional and personal differences of respondents.

This report dealt primarily with the findings and conclusions drawn from the analysis of data from the *small* and *large*

<sup>1</sup> The membership was identified by reference to "List of Accredited Institutions of Higher Education, July 1, 1959," THE NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION QUARTERLY, XXXIV (July, 1959), pp. 16-28; junior colleges were not included; the QUARTERLY was also the source of information regarding the level of approval (graduate or undergraduate). Information regarding the nature of control and enrollment figures was obtained from: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, *Education Directory, 1959-60, Part 3 Higher Education* (Washington; U. S. Government Printing Office, 1959), pp. 55-180.



TABLE 1  
CLASSIFICATION OF NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION INSTITUTIONS BY SIZE,  
CONTROL, AND LEVEL OF ACCREDITATION

Size	Nature of Control	Level of Approval by NCA	Total North Central Institutions	Number Included in Study
Less than 1,000	Private	Undergraduate	135	67
1,000 to 3,000	Private	Undergraduate	36	18
Less than 1,000	Private	Graduate	11	8
1,000 to 3,000	Private	Graduate	21	11
Less than 1,000	Public	Undergraduate	14	11
1,000 to 3,000	Public	Undergraduate	31	16
Less than 1,000	Public	Graduate	2	2
1,000 to 3,000	Public	Graduate	21	11
Over 3,000	Public	Undergraduate		
	Private	Graduate	79	20
Totals			350	164

institutions. Data or conclusions drawn from the *extra-large* institutions were limited to the identification of the critical problems.

#### PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF NEW FACULTY MEMBERS

The new faculty respondents provided information regarding their personal and professional characteristics and qualifications. To the limited extent that national data are available for comparison, there is a strong likelihood that the new faculty members who participated in this study were representative of new faculty members in similar institutions of higher education throughout the country. They may be characterized approximately as follows:

1. Their median age was 31, almost one-fourth being in the 27-29 age bracket.
2. Three in four were male.
3. Two-thirds were married.
4. Doctorates were held by 27 percent; all but 10 percent held at least a master's degree.
5. They earned their highest degrees from institutions in 43 different states and 10 foreign countries.
6. Three out of five had no previous college teaching experience.
7. Their first teaching assignments in 86 percent of the cases were in fields which included their highest degree major.
8. Most held ranks below associate professor level and teach only undergraduates.
9. Most planned to stay in college teaching.

These generalizations were based upon a detailed tabulation of data from 1,110 questionnaires, all of which represented new faculty members in institutions that enroll fewer than 3,000 students.

#### IDENTIFICATION OF "PROBLEMS"

The questionnaire contained: (a) ten specific problems of a personal nature; (b) twenty-five problems of an institutional nature; (c) fifteen problems of an instructional nature. The fifty items were chosen after a review of the literature and relevant studies; the results of an open-ended questionnaire sent to new faculty members in representative NCA institutions in Michigan; suggestions from NCA In-Service Education of Teachers Subcommittee; and a try-out of the questionnaire on a few new faculty members.

Each respondent was asked to evaluate each problem on the questionnaire, and was invited to add unlisted problems. With respect to each item, the respondent was asked to indicate whether the item had constituted a "problem" for him since he joined his institution's faculty. If he answered that the item was "never a problem," he proceeded to the next item. If the item *had been* a problem for him, he was asked to indicate the following: (1) whether the problem still existed, and (2)

whether it had been of "slight," "moderate," or "great" difficulty.

In short, each respondent was asked to evaluate each item as to its *presence*, *persistence*, and *degree of difficulty* as a problem for him. Average degrees of difficulty were computed. The eight problems that ranked at the top in degree of difficulty were defined as "critical problems."

Two separate sets of "critical problems" were identified as a result of analysis of responses: (1) the set of eight critical problems as identified by the new faculty members in the institutions that enroll fewer than 3,000 students; (2) the set of eight critical problems as identified by new faculty members in the institutions that enroll more than 3,000 students.

The *eight critical problems* identified by those serving in the 144 smaller institutions in order of degree of difficulty were:

1. Acquiring adequate secretarial help.
2. Finding suitable living quarters.
3. Understanding promotion and salary increase policies.
4. Lack of teaching aids.
5. Acquiring adequate office space.
6. Knowing what other departments expect of my department.
7. Using effective discussion techniques in class.
8. Developing effective lectures.<sup>1</sup>

The *eight critical problems* identified by those serving in the twenty extra-large institutions in order of degree of difficulty were:

1. Acquiring adequate secretarial help.
2. Acquiring adequate office space.
3. Understanding promotion and salary increase policies.
4. Finding suitable living quarters.
5. Knowing what other departments expect of my department.
6. Knowing what other departments of the college teach.
7. Fulfilling expectations regarding research activities.
8. Knowing the institutional procedure to be followed for curriculum revision.

<sup>1</sup> For the listing by rank of the degree of difficulty of all fifty problems and the percent reporting some difficulty with each as reported by those in the smaller institutions, see "Problems of New Faculty Members in North Central Association Colleges and Universities of Less than 3,000 enrollment," Harlan R. McCall. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1961. 172 pp.

While those in smaller institutions identified three *instructional* problems among the eight giving them the most difficulty (Nos. 4, 7, and 8), none of these was found among the most critical problems identified by those in the extra-large institutions. Replacing these in the critical problems identified by new faculty in the extra-large institutions were three problems of an *institutional* nature (Nos. 6, 7, and 8).

There were eleven problems which were identified by more than 40 percent of the new faculty members in the smaller institutions as giving them some degree of difficulty since coming to the present NCA institution. They were:

1. Acquiring adequate secretarial help.
2. Lack of teaching aids.
3. Understanding college policies regarding promotions and salary increases.
4. Finding suitable living quarters.
5. Learning curriculum requirements.
6. Developing effective lectures.
7. Increasing my effectiveness in student counseling techniques.
8. Using effective discussion techniques in class.
9. Knowing what other departments of the college expect of my department.
10. Fulfilling expectations regarding total amount of responsibilities.
11. Obtaining and maintaining student interest.

The only *critical problem* not identified by those in smaller institutions was *acquiring adequate office space*.

There were six problems which were identified by more than 40 percent of the new faculty members in the extra-large institutions as giving them some degree of difficulty. They were:

1. Acquiring adequate secretarial help.
2. Understanding college policies regarding promotions and salary increases.
3. Knowing what other departments of the college expect of my department.
4. Learning curriculum requirements.
5. Acquiring adequate office space.
6. Finding suitable living quarters.

All of these items were among the *critical problems* identified by new faculty members in the extra-large institutions.

#### PERSISTENCE OF CRITICAL PROBLEMS

Information secured from those in insti-

tutions of less than 3,000 enrollment was analyzed to determine the persistence of problems.<sup>1</sup> One personal problem, *finding satisfactory recreational outlets for self or family*, was indicated as persisting by more than 80 percent of those who had experienced some difficulty with this problem since coming to their present institution. This problem seemed to cause difficulty to only 27 percent of the total respondents; yet those who reported this problem evidently had considerable difficulty in resolving it to their satisfaction.

Six institutional problems were also rated as persisting by more than 80 percent of those who had experienced difficulty with them. In this group were found two of the top ten problems indicated most frequently as causing difficulty. They were *acquiring adequate secretarial help* and *understanding college policies regarding promotions and salary increases*. Also in this group were the two top-ranking problems in persistence, *fulfilling expectations regarding research activities*, persisting at 90 percent; and *understanding faculty-trustee relationships*, persisting at 88 percent. Other institutional problems persisting at or above the 80 percent level were: *having little opportunity to work on college committees* and *understanding policies regarding research*.

Three instructional problems persisting above the 80 percent level were: *lack of teaching aids*, *co-ordinating instruction in my classes with instruction in other college departments*, and *too many "extra class" responsibilities on faculty committees*.

While the percent of new faculty members finishing their third year in NCA colleges and universities indicating persistence of personal problems was somewhat less than the percent finishing their first year, the difference was not great. Persistence of all personal problems for all participants in the study was 62.5 percent, with 64.7 percent of first-year teachers indicating persistence and 58.9 percent of third-year teachers. Personal problems notice-

ably different in percent of persistence from first- to third-year faculty members were *becoming acquainted with faculty members* decreasing by 13 percent, and *establishing satisfactory relationships in the community*, decreasing by 10 percent.

Problems of an institutional character, persisting at a somewhat higher level than personal problems, 68.2 percent as compared to 62.5 percent, were also reported as persisting slightly less frequently by third-year faculty members than by first. Two institutional problems noticeably different in percent of persistence among first- and third-year faculty members were *learning curriculum requirements*, decreasing from 52 to 37 percent, and *knowing institutional procedures to follow for curriculum revision*, decreasing from 63 to 51 percent.

Most noteworthy of the findings regarding persistence of problems was the fact that instructional problems as a whole persisted at as high a level among third-year as among first-year faculty members. In other words, third-year teachers who felt that they had had some instructional problems since coming to their present positions did not feel that they had come any nearer solving these problems than those teachers who had only been in these institutions for one year. In fact, one instructional problem, *becoming acquainted with pupils in my classes*, was reported as persisting at a 14 percent higher level by third-year than by first-year faculty members.

#### ANALYSES OF "CRITICAL PROBLEMS"

The questionnaires submitted by new faculty members in the two smaller groups of institutions were analyzed in detail in order to determine whether in the perception of problems by new faculty members there were significant differences that were related to (a) the four personal factors of sex, age, level of academic preparation, or previous professional experience and (b) the three institutional factors of size, nature of control, and level of instruction for which institutions were accredited. This statistical analysis has been

<sup>1</sup> Harlan R. McCall, pp. 56-63.



made of questionnaires from new faculty members in institutions that enroll fewer than 1,000 students and from those in institutions that enroll between 1,000 and 2,000 students; it was not made of questionnaires representing faculty members in the extra-large institutions.<sup>1</sup>

Six of the seven factors were found to be significant with respect to the degree of difficulty new faculty members experienced with at least one of the eight problems which they identified as being critical. The personal factor "level of academic preparation" was the only factor not found significant with respect to perceptions of critical problems.

Young new faculty members reported significantly greater difficulty with the instructional problems of *developing effective lectures* and *lack of teaching aids* than did the older members.

Men reported significantly greater difficulty with *finding suitable living quarters* and *acquiring adequate secretarial help* than did women.

The new faculty members with no previous college teaching experience were found to report much more difficulty with *developing effective lectures* and using *effective discussion techniques* than did those who had had previous college experience.

Those new faculty members in large institutions reported significantly more difficulty with the problem of *knowing what other departments expect of my department* than did those in smaller institutions.

Those serving in public institutions reported much more difficulty with *finding suitable living quarters* and *understanding college policies regarding promotions and salary increases* than did those in private institutions.

The level of accreditation by the NCA proved to be a significant factor for only one of the critical problems, *understanding college policies regarding promotions and salary increases*. Those serving in accredited undergraduate institutions reported

this to be a greater problem than did those in accredited graduate institutions.

#### HELPLEFULNESS AND USE OF ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES

New faculty members in the institutions of less than 3,000 enrollment rated the following administrative procedures as being most helpful in assisting them to solve their problems:<sup>2</sup>

- Introduced to faculty soon after arrival, in use by 94 percent.
- Open door policy of administrators, in use by 85 percent.
- Furnished further printed material (such as faculty handbook) after appointment, in use by 80 percent.
- Expected visit to campus before appointment, in use by 83 percent.
- Scheduled departmental meetings, in use by 72 percent.
- Light teaching load for new faculty, in use by 36 percent.

It was evident from the comparable data of *helpfulness* and *use* that in many respects administrators in the sample NCA institutions were using the administrative procedures which new faculty members felt were most helpful to them in resolving their problems. The coefficient of correlation between the estimated *helpfulness* and *use* of the twenty-five procedures investigated was .87.

However, there were two noticeable differences in rankings in the *helpfulness* and *use* of two administrative advices. Respondents felt that *light teaching loads* would be particularly helpful in solving their problems, but that relatively few administrators, only 36 percent, used such a device.

One other particularly noteworthy

<sup>2</sup> The questionnaire listed twenty-five administrative procedures. These were chosen after a review of relevant studies and a series of preliminary tests similar to those used in selecting the list of fifty problems. Each respondent was asked to evaluate each item and was invited to add unlisted procedures. With respect to each item, the respondent was asked whether the procedure indicated had been utilized in his institution. If used, he was asked to indicate of how much help it had been for him: none, slight, moderate, or great. If the procedure was not used in his institution, he was asked to estimate its degree of potential helpfulness: none, slight, moderate, or great.

<sup>1</sup> For complete data, statistical method used for analysis of data, and analysis, see dissertation and its 70 tables.

difference in rating of helpfulness and use of administrative procedure was in relationship to the *immediate assignment to committee*. The respondents rated this as the least helpful of the twenty-five procedures; yet it was reported by 51 percent of the respondents as being used in their institutions.

### CONCLUSIONS

Some of the conclusions which were drawn from this study follow:

1. Some personal, institutional, and instructional problems which have faced new faculty members in NCA colleges and universities of less than 3,000 enrollment remained as problems to them after three years of service.

2. In the opinion of new faculty members in NCA colleges and universities, a higher percent of their problems of a personal nature and those associated with the institutions in which they were serving were being solved to their satisfaction than were those problems of an instructional nature. No instructional problem, however, was found among the top three problems identified as most critical.

3. The orientation and in-service programs of NCA colleges and universities were failing to come to grips with instructional problems as perceived by new faculty members in the NCA institutions of less than 3,000 enrollment. These problems persisted at a high level, 71.2 percent, even with third-year faculty members.

4. Not only did the orientation and in-service techniques used by administrators in NCA colleges and universities as evaluated by new faculty members vary in quantity but also in degree of helpfulness in resolving problems of new faculty. This was evident from the wide range of degree of helpfulness ratings given the twenty-five administrative procedures used in the questionnaire.

5. The high response from the questionnaire, requests which have come to the author for copies of the questionnaire and results of the study by administrators and faculty members give evidence that

there is a high degree of interest in the improvement of orientation and in-service programs among NCA institutions through identification of faculty determined critical problems.

6. From the analysis of data from institutions of less than 3,000 enrollment the following conclusions are drawn regarding the relationship between the critical problems identified by new faculty members and variables used in this study:

- a. General predictions cannot be made concerning the relationship which might be expected between the institutional and personal factors and degree of difficulty of critical problems which new faculty members might identify, since for no one of the institutional or personal variables was there a significant difference in the degree of difficulty evident for each of the critical problems.

- b. Men members of the faculty have a tendency to report a significantly higher degree of difficulty with the problems of housing and acquiring adequate secretarial assistance than do women, but there appears to be no sex difference in the identification of critical problems of an instructional nature.

- c. Young members of the faculty have more difficulty with problems of an instructional nature than do the older members who join NCA faculties. In two of the three critical instructional problems in this study—*developing effective lectures* and *lack of teaching aids*—these differences were found to be significant at the five percent level.

- d. New faculty members who have had no previous college experience have more difficulty with instructional problems identified by all new faculty members as being critical than do those who have had previous college teaching experience. Differences were found to be significant in two of the three critical problems tested—*developing effective lectures*, at the one percent level, and *using effective discussion techniques*, at the five percent level. Experience and age do not appear to be significant factors in the degree of difficulty of other than instructional problems.



e. Those new faculty members serving in colleges and universities with enrollments of 1,000 to 3,000 are more apt to recognize the difficulty they experience in solving their critical personal and institutional problems than are those serving in smaller institutions. However, in this study there was found to be a significant difference at the five percent level related to size of institution for only one problem, that of *knowing what other departments expect of my department*.

f. Those serving in public institutions are more apt to have a greater degree of difficulty than those in private institutions with the problems of housing and understanding college policies regarding promotion and salary increases. Those in private institutions tend to report more difficulty with instructional problems than those in public institutions, but no significant differences were evident.

g. New faculty members serving in institutions approved for graduate study and those serving in institutions approved for only undergraduate programs by NCA apparently do not view critical problems of a personal or instructional nature significantly different in difficulty. However, those in undergraduate institutions evidence a higher degree of difficulty in *understanding college policies regarding promotions and salary increases* than do those in graduate approved institutions. The difference was found to be significant at the five percent level.

7. It became evident as the study progressed from one stage of investigation of the critical problems to the next that conclusions in studies of this kind having the same raw data could differ widely depending upon the method of analysis chosen. If the investigator had stopped at stage one, the conclusions relative to the relationship between the intensity of the critical problems and the personal and institutional characteristics of the respondents would have been considerably different than they were.

In Table 2 will be found a summary of the results of the investigation of the degree of difficulty of the critical problems

at the initial and final stages of investigation. It will be noted that there were five areas having differences significant in at least one-half of the groups tested at stage one which were not significant at stage three. In three areas significant differences were found at stage three that were not evident at stage one.

#### SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

As this study progressed it became apparent that there were additional studies which might be made to shed further light upon the problems of new faculty members in institutions of higher education in the United States so that in-service and orientation programs might be made more effective:

1. Data collected for this study might be analyzed further to determine (a) if the degree of difficulty on critical problems identified by new faculty members are significantly related to the turnover of faculty members in these institutions; (b) if there are certain types of institutions which by faculty evaluation seem to be using better administrative techniques of aiding new faculty members to meet their problems than other types of institutions; (c) if the critical problems perceived by those who aspire to positions other than the ones they are now holding are different from the critical problems perceived by those who do not aspire to other types of positions; (d) if the critical problems identified by either males or females are related to their marital status.

2. Since critical problems of new faculty members were determined by a weighted scale technique and analyzed through use of a central tendency there no doubt are certain problems which new faculty members have an inclination to rate at the extremes of the difficulty scale as "no problem" or "great" in magnitude that are not revealed as critical by this analysis. Such a study could be undertaken with the data on hand by studying only the extremes in responses instead of using a weighted scale technique.

3. Administrators of the same institutions as used in this study might be sur-



TABLE 2

COMPARISON OF AREAS IN WHICH SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN DEGREE OF DIFFICULTY FOR EACH CRITICAL PROBLEM WERE FOUND IN STAGES ONE AND THREE

Critical Problems	Personal Characteristics				Institutional Factors		
	Age	De- gree	Sex	Expe- rience	Size	Con- trol	Level
Finding suitable living quarters			X*			X	
Knowing what other departments expect of my department					Z		
Acquiring adequate office space							
Acquiring adequate secretarial help		Y	X			Y	
Understanding college policies regarding promotions and salary increases	Y					X	Z
Lack of teaching aids	Z						
Developing effective lectures	X	Y		X			
Using effective discussion techniques	Y			X			

\* Explanation of symbols: X indicates direction of significant difference evident at both stage one and stage three; Y indicates significant difference evident at stage one in at least half of the groups tested, not at stage three; Z indicates direction of significant difference evident at stage three, not at stage one.

veyed as to their ratings of the effectiveness of administrative procedures they have used in aiding faculty adjustment.

4. A follow-up study of those who have left institutions at their own or at the administration's initiative might be conducted to determine the relation between the critical problems identified by these two groups and those who have remained in these institutions for at least three years.

5. Since no attempt was made to analyze the responses of those new faculty members in institutions of more than 3,000 enrollment, except for the identification of the critical problems, an analysis similar to that reported here for the smaller institutions could be undertaken.

6. Since this study involved only faculty members in colleges and universities having at least four-year programs, a similar study might be made of problems of faculty members at the Junior College level.

7. Since the characteristics of NCA new faculty members used as variables in this study do not seem to be much differ-

ent than the characteristics of new faculty members being employed in similar institutions throughout the country, findings here might have implications for more than NCA institutions. Such, however, could not be tested since exact comparable data regarding the characteristics of new faculty members being employed in similar institutions throughout the United States is not available. Further research would be necessary to prove this hypothesis. In addition, studies similar to this study might be conducted outside the NCA area to determine if regions of the United States make a difference in problems perceived by new faculty members to be most critical.

8. Since the methodology in this study involved the identification of critical problems of new faculty members by those who would admit to experiencing these problems, a more impersonal approach might be made by asking them to identify the presence and degree of difficulty of problems which other new faculty members experience.

9. Since the conclusions drawn in the

study relative to the degree of difficulty of the critical problems as related to the personal and institutional characteristics of the respondents were based upon a system of combining matched-groupings, it is suggested that the same procedure might be used in any comparative study to be done in the future. As was evidenced in this study, other methods of analysis might yield quite different results. (The information in Table 2 emphasizes the dangers involved in leaping to conclusions on the basis of superficial examination of survey data; *prima facie* "significance" at early stages of analysis may evaporate under more sophisticated analysis.)

#### IMPLICATIONS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICES

If the above conclusions are valid, the results of this study should have implications for all administrators in colleges (similar to those used in this study) who have anything to do with the planning or the execution of any orientation or in-service program for new faculty members.

Even though institutional factors used as variables in this study help to indicate to the administrator the problems of greatest difficulty he might expect new faculty members in his institution to have, each institution has some unique features which cannot be accounted for in a study of this nature. Administrators should make an attempt to discover the problems of adjustment that are causing new faculty members in their particular institution the most concern, since there may be critical problems in their institution which are not reflected as such by this or any similar study.

Any administrator must realize that the study of individual problems of faculty members is essential if the best possible in-service program is to be made available to the new faculty members on his staff. Even though this study shows some major problems with which the administrator needs to be concerned, the success or failure of any orientation and in-service program will be determined by any new faculty member in light of the assistance

such program gives him in solving his problems.

Administrators need to be concerned about the problems of providing adequate secretarial help and adequate office space for their new faculty members. These were indicated among the top eight most critical problems by those in this study. They may be placed at the top because the new faculty members see the differences between the secretarial assistance and office space allotted to them and that which has been allotted to older members of the faculty; they may see these as status symbols and for this reason view them as problems. Nevertheless, to the new faculty members these are real problems. Administrators need to take a close look at the situation in their institutions to know if they too evaluate these as real problems. If such is the case, administrative plans should be made for more adequate office space and additional secretarial help for their new faculty members.

This study not only has implications for the administrator who is planning the orientation and in-service program of new faculty members but also for anyone who is assisting the prospective college teacher in an assessment of the profession as it is and in the planning of pre-service education so that the critical problems will be minimized for him.

Implications for improvement of orientation and in-service programs based upon this study include the following:

1. New faculty members should not be assigned immediately to faculty committees. They should be given time to become acquainted with the institution and its policies through other means.

2. Administrators should plan for introduction of new faculty members to other faculty members soon after arrival on campus, followed by regularly scheduled faculty meetings and an open door administrative policy if, in the eyes of new faculty members, they are to have the most effective means of helping new faculty members resolve their problems.

3. Administrators might pay more attention to the housing of new faculty members. Men, in particular, find this to

be a pressing personal problem as they begin their duties in NCA colleges and universities. Institutional housing or a housing service in cooperation with community real estate dealers are possible solutions.

4. The orientation and in-service programs designed to assist the young new faculty members in resolving their instructional problems probably should be more intense than those for older faculty members, since this study reveals a higher level of difficulty with critical problems of instruction as reported by the young faculty members. Since the younger faculty members realize their instructional weaknesses, they should benefit greatly from any assistance given them. Instructional deans might well assume the major responsibility for this assistance in small institutions; division or department heads, in large institutions. Regular opportunity for young new faculty members to meet with those assisting them to improve their teaching methods should be a part of the administrative plan of every institution. In addition to discussing any special problems of instruction or evaluation of instruction which they face, the group might read and discuss such books as Gilbert Highet's *The Art of Teaching* and Jacques Barzun's *Teacher in America*.

5. Orientation and in-service programs for new faculty members who have had no previous college experience should be geared to assisting them to develop effective lectures and to use effective discussion techniques, since it is in these areas where the inexperienced college teacher indicates a high degree of difficulty. Deans or others in charge of improving instruction should not overlook the possibilities of assistance to these inexperienced college teachers through such techniques as seminars on college teaching and classroom visitations. Although visits to classes was not given a high use or helpfulness rating by those in this study, the writer believes that such assistance to the inexperienced college teacher by an understanding supervisor would help him gain confidence in meeting his instructional problems.

6. Administrators in large institutions should make an effort to see that communication between departments is improved. New faculty members in institutions over 1,000 enrollment in this study felt that they did not know what other departments of the college or university expected of the department in which they were serving. This might be accomplished through a sharing of the curriculum plan at faculty meetings; through special faculty bulletins in which each department presents what it believes its curricular responsibilities to be; through department heads' giving to new faculty members in their departments at the pre-school conference and throughout the year what they believe other departments of the college or university expect from their departments.

7. Since this study revealed a relatively high difficulty level by new faculty members serving in public institutions concerning *faculty housing* and *understanding college policies regarding promotions and salary increases*, administrators in these institutions might see what could and should be done locally to assist in resolving these problems.

8. Administrators in public NCA accredited undergraduate institutions might find it advisable to strengthen their attempt to promote an understanding of college policies regarding promotions and salary increases since this was not only recognized as a critical problem by those in this study but was found to be more of a problem to those in public accredited undergraduate institutions than to those in private institutions and those accredited for graduate study. Some of this lack of understanding regarding this policy may stem from a failure on the part of the administration to have a systematized method for assessing the quality of teaching being done, rather than the matter of communication. If this is the case, a more systematized method of evaluation should be developed.

Accepting the data at face value and without seeking deeper meanings, there are some serious implications for higher



education in the bold facts that faculty members perceived as real problems such as acquiring office space, finding living quarters, acquiring secretarial help, and other such items. Higher education is presumably to be faced by a scarcity of qualified faculty personnel in the immediate future. If faculty personnel are allowed to be troubled by non-professional matters, there is reason to question whether higher education is making effective use of its investment of resources; that is, there is reason to question whether higher education can tolerate a situation in which faculty energies are dissipated in fighting housekeeping problems.

### QUESTIONS RAISED BY STUDY

It may be useful simply to enumerate a series of questions raised by this study, and to speculate regarding possible answers.

1. Why were no instructional matters found among the first eight critical problems identified by new faculty members at the institutions that enroll 3,000 students or more? Perhaps they were just as interested in teaching as were their counterparts in smaller institutions, but found instructional problems relatively less difficult for them than were the complexities of life within a complex institution—that is, perhaps the large institutions simply posed more problems for the new faculty member.

2. Why did "acquiring adequate secretarial help" loom as a larger problem for male than for female faculty members? Is secretarial help one of the status symbols of higher education? Do male faculty members attempt to do more research and/or scholarly writing and therefore have a greater need for secretarial help than do females? If this is a matter of career orientation, single faculty women may be more intent upon research and writing than are married faculty women; hence, they are more concerned about secretarial help. Is there a difference, with respect to their perceptions of this problem, between married and single female faculty members or between single female

faculty members and faculty men?

3. Why did "finding suitable living quarters" pose a greater problem for men than for women, and why was it a greater problem in public colleges and universities than in private ones? Were those who found the problem difficult the married or single new faculty members? Were they house-hunters or dwellers in efficiency apartments? The problem may be entirely unrelated to the sex of the new faculty member, and reflect simply the fact that the types of housing required are relatively unavailable in particular communities, or that salaries paid by the employing institutions are so low that the expense of housing constitutes a serious problem. Perhaps the faculties of public institutions are growing more rapidly than those of private colleges; hence, housing demand is greater and housing is a more difficult problem in communities which surround public institutions.

4. "Acquiring adequate office space" ranked higher as a critical problem among new faculty members in the large institutions (over 3,000) than it did among those in smaller institutions, and it reportedly caused a great degree of difficulty. Is this a significant fact? It may mean simply that large institutions are now more cramped for office space than are the smaller ones. It may mean that office space is a more important status symbol within large institutions than it is in small ones.

5. "Lack of teaching aids" was found to be a critical problem among new faculty members in small and large institutions, but not in the extra-large ones. This may mean simply that, in absolute measurements, teaching aids are genuinely scarcer in smaller institutions than they are in larger colleges and universities.

6. "Developing effective lectures" was identified as a critical problem among new faculty in the small institutions only, and a significantly more difficult problem for young and inexperienced faculty members than it was for older and experienced members. That this should discriminate between young and old, and between

experienced and inexperienced, seems predictable. Why should it not have been a critical problem among new faculty members in the larger institutions, however? One possibility is that teaching may be relatively more difficult in the smaller institutions; that is, the new faculty mem-

ber in the small college may teach two or three different courses and have to prepare a dozen lectures each week, whereas his counterpart in the larger institution may teach several sections of a single course and therefore have to prepare only three or four lectures per week.

R. NELSON SNIDER,  
*Treasurer, South Side High School, Fort Wayne, Indiana*

# Treasurer's Report for the Fiscal Year

July 1, 1960—June 30, 1961

KOENEMAN, BORGER, KROUSE & DINIUS, Certified Public Accountants of Fort Wayne, Indiana, have continuously audited the treasurer's accounts since he assumed office in 1951. The treasurer is bonded for \$40,000 and his secretary for \$10,000.

The following report, as indicated in the letter to the treasurer, is dated July 25, 1961.

July 25, 1961

Mr. R. Nelson Snider, Treasurer  
North Central Association of  
Colleges and Secondary Schools  
Fort Wayne, Indiana

## SCOPE OF EXAMINATION

We have examined the balance sheet of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools as at June 30, 1961, and the related statement of changes in fund balances for the year then ended. Our examination was made in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards, and accordingly included such tests of the accounting records and such other auditing procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances.

In accordance with practice consistently followed by the Association, the records are maintained on a cash basis, and all purchases of fixed assets, consisting principally of office equipment at various offices, have been charged to expense.

In our opinion, subject to the representations of the secretaries of the revolving funds as to balances controlled by them, the accompanying balance sheet and statement of changes in fund balances, present fairly the financial position of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools as at June 30, 1961, and the results of its financial activities for the year then ended, in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles for non-profit educational institutions applied on a basis consistent with that of the preceding year.

KOENEMAN, BORGER, KROUSE & DINIUS

## INDEX

### AUDITOR'S REPORT

#### Report Letter:

- Scope Examination
- Comments on Balance Sheet
- Comments on Activities

Comparative Balance Sheets, June 30, 1961 and June 30, 1960.....

Statement of Changes in Fund Balances for the year ended June 30, 1961.....

Exhibit  
"A"  
"B"

Statement of Income and Expenses—Developmental Fund for the years ended June 30, 1961 and June 30, 1960.....

Statement of Expenses for the years ended June 30, 1961 and June 30, 1960.....

Schedule  
"I"  
"II"

### COMMENTS ON BALANCE SHEET

Cash on deposit—\$207,446.14

The cash on deposit at June 30, 1961 was verified directly with the depositories and the amounts reported to us were reconciled with the following balances:



*Checking Accounts:*

The Peoples Trust and Savings Company, Fort Wayne, Indiana.....	\$22,197.62	
Lincoln National Bank and Trust Company, Fort Wayne, Indiana.....	48,371.36	
The First National Bank of Chicago, Illinois.....	15,386.84	\$ 85,955.82

*Savings Accounts:*

The Peoples Trust and Savings Company, Fort Wayne, Indiana.....	\$56,265.04	
Lincoln National Bank and Trust Company, Fort Wayne, Indiana.....	53,767.90	
Continental Illinois National Bank and Trust Company, Chicago, Illinois..	5,540.63	
South Holland Trust and Savings Bank, South Holland, Illinois.....	5,916.75	121,490.32
		<u>\$207,446.14</u>

Copies of the official receipts issued by the Treasurer's office for cash received were traced to the cash records and to the record of deposits in the various bank accounts. The returned paid checks and supporting vouchers, authorizing the disbursements of cash, were inspected.

The cash on deposit consists of amounts for use by the following funds or projects:

Liberal Arts Education Study.....	\$ 8,921.01
Inspection and Survey.....	5,888.63
Field Service Council.....	1,285.99
Generalist Inspection.....	1,398.08
Institutions for Teacher Education.....	4,610.22
Foreign Relations.....	15,335.20
Leadership Training.....	37,813.83
Superior and Talented Students.....	53,888.94
Human Relations in the Classroom.....	1,266.57
Television.....	3,463.02
General Fund (Reserve).....	15,000.00
Developmental.....	58,574.65
	<u>\$207,446.14</u>

*Revolving funds with Secretaries of Commissions—\$1,394.83*

The balances in the revolving funds held by the secretaries of commissions and the QUARTERLY office were verified by examining the reports submitted to the Treasurer of the Association as at June 30, 1961.

Disbursements from the revolving funds are made and reported periodically by the secretaries in charge of the funds. The funds are reimbursed by the Treasurer in accordance with the budget allotments.

The following amounts on hand were reported as at June 30, 1961:

Norman Burns, Secretary, North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.....	\$ 390.18
Norman Burns, Secretary, Commission on Colleges and Universities.....	635.10
Anne Stameshkin, Associate Secretary, North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools (QUARTERLY office).....	45.39
A. J. Gibson, Secretary, Commission on Secondary Schools.....	324.16
	<u>\$1,394.83</u>

*Liberal Arts Education Study—\$8,921.01*

The balance in this fund at June 30, 1961 is \$8,921.01 and is represented by cash on deposit. Receipts were credited to this fund in the amount of \$14,401.10 for the year and disbursements totaling \$14,741.51 were made.

Exhibit "B" reflects a decrease of \$340.41 from the balance in the fund at June 30, 1960.

*Inspection and Survey—\$5,888.63*

During the year ended June 30, 1961, receipts were credited to this fund in the amount of \$27,667.21 and disbursements were made in the amount of \$21,059.59. Ten thousand dollars were transferred from this fund to the Developmental fund of the Association as at June 30, 1961. The balance remaining after this transfer is \$5,888.63 which is represented by cash on deposit.

*Field Service Council—\$1,285.99*

Receipts were credited to the Field Service Council fund for the year ended June 30, 1961 in the amount of \$4,855.78 and the disbursements were \$5,526.78. The balance in the fund, which is represented by cash on deposit, at June 30, 1961 is \$1,285.99.

*Generalist Inspection—\$1,398.08*

Receipts in the amount of \$3,005.76 and disbursements in the amount of \$2,533.55 were reflected in the fund during the year ended June 30, 1961. The balance of \$1,398.08 in the fund at the close of the year is represented by cash on deposit.

*Institutions for Teachers' Education—\$4,610.22*

The disbursements from the Institutions for Teachers' Education fund for the year totaled \$4,816.78 which was in excess of the receipts by \$1,189.78. Exhibit "B" reflects the decrease in the fund balance as at June 30, 1961. The fund balance of \$4,610.22 is represented by cash on deposit.

*Foreign Relations—\$15,335.20*

Receipts from the sale of books credited to this fund during the year amounted to \$74,922.77. Disbursements totaling \$106,040.21 were made during the year from this fund. As reflected on Exhibit "B," the fund balance at June 30, 1961 is \$15,335.20. As cash is received, it is deposited in the First National Bank in Chicago. The receipts are recorded by the Treasurer when notification of the bank deposit is received.

*Readership Training—\$37,813.83*

Disbursements from this fund during the year amounted to \$26,647.70, leaving an unexpended balance of \$37,813.83 which is represented by cash on deposit at June 30, 1961.

*Superior and Talented Students—\$53,888.94*

The balance of Carnegie Corporation appropriation in the amount of \$120,000.00 was received for use on this project. Other receipts from sales and royalties amounted to \$3,979.52. Disbursements of \$112,100.97 were made from this fund during the year.

The balance in this fund represented by cash on deposit is \$53,888.94 at June 30, 1961.

*Human Relations in the Classroom—\$1,266.57*

As reflected on Exhibit "B," contributions to this fund for the year were \$1,800.00 and disbursements were \$2,497.66. The balance in the fund, represented by cash on deposit, at June 30, 1961 is \$1,266.57.

*Television—\$3,463.02*

This project received \$28,575.00 during the current year. The disbursements were \$23,136.98. The fund balance at June 30, 1961 is \$3,463.02 and this amount is represented by cash on deposit.

*General Fund—\$15,000.00*

There were no changes in this fund balance during the current year.

*Developmental Fund—\$58,720.60*

The activities of the association, other than those under specific funds, are reflected in Schedule I. The excess of income over disbursements in the amount of \$9,526.84, plus \$10,000.00 transferred from Inspection and Survey results in a fund balance of \$58,720.60 at June 30, 1961.

## COMMENTS ON ACTIVITIES

Schedule I presents the results of the activities of the association for the years ended June 30, 1961 and June 30, 1960.

The total receipts for the current year were \$6,627.95 more than for the previous year. The expenses increased \$2,995.42 over the previous year.

The net gain resulting from activities chargeable to the Developmental Fund for the year ended June 30, 1961 is \$9,526.84 compared with a net gain of \$5,894.31 for the previous year.

The details of the income and expenses for the years ended June 30, 1961 and June 30, 1960 are shown in Schedule I. A more detailed analysis of the expenses is presented in Schedule II.

A condensed summary of the income and expenses for the last four years is as follows:

Year Ended June 30,

Income:	1961	1960	1959	1958
Membership dues.....	\$150,135	\$144,785	\$140,775	\$137,260
Application fees.....	1,565	2,170	1,720	1,830
Sale of QUARTERLIES.....	2,421	1,936	1,945	1,680
Other sales.....	108	807	20	20
Royalties and miscellaneous.....	6,627	4,530	5,351	3,540
Total Income.....	\$160,856	\$154,228	\$149,811	\$144,510
Expenses.....	151,329	148,334	143,821	137,480
Net Gain.....	\$ 9,527	\$ 5,894	\$ 5,990	\$ 7,020

## Exhibit "A"

## NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS

R. NELSON SNIDER, TREASURER

## COMPARATIVE BALANCE SHEETS, JUNE 30, 1961 AND JUNE 30, 1960

	1961	1960	Increase (Decrease)
<b>ASSETS</b>			
Cash:			
On deposit.....	\$207,446.14	\$234,332.84	\$ (26,886.70)
Revolving funds with Secretaries of Commissions.....	1,394.83	1,106.84	287.99
Prepaid Blue Cross/Blue Shield premiums.....	145.95	—	145.95
Total Working Funds.....	\$208,986.92	\$235,439.68	\$ (26,452.76)
Total Assets.....	\$208,986.92	\$235,439.68	\$ (26,452.76)
<b>LIABILITIES AND FUND BALANCES</b>			
Liabilities:			
None.....	\$ —	\$ —	\$ —
Fund Balances:			
Projects:			
Liberal Arts Education Study.....	\$ 8,021.01	\$ 9,261.42	\$ ( 340.41)
Inspection and Survey.....	5,888.63	9,281.01	( 3,392.38)
Field Service Council.....	1,285.00	1,956.00	( 671.00)
Generalist Inspection.....	1,398.08	925.87	472.21
Institutions for Teacher Education.....	4,610.22	5,800.00	( 1,189.78)
Foreign Relations.....	15,335.20	46,452.64	(31,117.44)
Leadership Training.....	37,813.83	64,461.53	(26,647.70)
Superior and Talented Students.....	53,888.94	42,010.39	11,878.55
Human Relations in the Classroom.....	1,266.57	1,964.23	( 697.66)
Television.....	3,463.02	(1,975.00)	5,438.02
	\$133,871.49	\$180,139.08	\$ (46,267.59)
Administration:			
General Fund.....	\$ 15,000.00	\$ 15,000.00	\$ —
Developmental.....	58,720.00	39,193.76	19,526.24
Revolving Funds—Secretaries of Commissions.....	1,394.83	1,106.84	287.99
	\$ 75,115.43	\$ 55,300.60	\$ 19,814.83
Total Fund Balances.....	208,986.92	235,439.68	\$ (26,452.76)
Total Liabilities and Fund Balances.....	\$208,986.92	\$235,439.68	\$ (26,452.76)

## Exhibit "B"

## NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS

R. NELSON SNIDER, TREASURER

## STATEMENT OF CHANGES IN FUND BALANCES FOR THE YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 1961

	Balance July 1, 1960	Receipts	Total	Disbursements	Balance June 30, 1961
Projects:					
Liberal Arts Education Study.....	\$ 9,261.42	\$ 14,401.10	\$ 23,662.52	\$ 14,741.51	\$ 8,921.01
Inspection and Survey.....	9,281.01	27,667.21	36,948.22	21,059.59	5,888.63
				(A) 10,000.00	
Field Service Council.....	1,956.00	4,855.78	6,811.77	5,526.78	1,285.00
Generalist Inspection.....	925.87	3,005.76	3,931.63	2,533.55	1,398.08
Institutions for Teachers' Education.....	5,800.00	3,627.00	9,427.00	4,816.78	4,610.22
Foreign Relations.....	46,452.64	74,922.77	121,375.41	106,040.21	15,335.20
Leadership Training.....	64,461.53	—	64,461.53	26,647.70	37,813.83
Superior and Talented Students.....	42,010.39	123,979.52	165,989.91	112,100.97	53,888.94
Human Relations in the Classroom.....	1,964.23	1,800.00	3,764.23	2,497.66	1,266.57
Television.....	(1,975.00)	28,575.00	26,600.00	23,136.98	3,463.02
	\$180,139.08	\$282,834.14	\$462,973.22	\$320,101.73	\$133,871.49



Administration:					
General Fund.....	\$ 15,000.00	\$ —	\$ 15,000.00	\$ —	\$ 15,000.00
Developmental Fund.....	19,193.76	(A) 160,856.29	210,050.05	151,329.45	58,720.60
		10,000.00			
Revolving Funds—Secretaries of Commissions.....	1,106.84	12,117.07	13,223.91	11,829.08	1,394.83
	\$ 55,300.60	\$182,973.36	\$238,273.96	\$163,158.53	\$ 75,115.43
als.....	\$235,439.68	\$465,807.50	\$701,247.18	\$492,260.26	\$208,986.92
Note (A)—\$10,000.00 transferred from Inspection and Survey to Developmental Fund					

## Schedule I

## NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS

R. NELSON SNIDER, TREASURER

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF INCOME AND EXPENSE—DEVELOPMENTAL FUND  
FOR THE YEARS ENDED JUNE 30, 1961 AND JUNE 30, 1960

	1961	1960	Increase (Decrease)
Income:			
Membership Dues:			
Universities and colleges.....	\$ 73,010.00	\$ 69,015.00	\$ 3,995.00
Secondary schools.....	74,325.00	73,320.00	1,005.00
Dependents' schools.....	2,800.00	2,450.00	350.00
Application fees.....	1,565.00	2,170.00	( 605.00)
Total Fees.....	\$151,700.00	\$146,955.00	\$ 4,745.00
Other Income:			
Sale of QUARTERLIES.....	\$ 2,421.62	\$ 1,936.45	\$ 485.17
Royalties.....	364.10	487.01	( 123.81)
Sale of reprints and miscellaneous.....	107.75	806.86	( 699.11)
Interest.....	6,262.82	4,042.12	2,220.70
Total Other Income.....	\$ 9,156.29	\$ 7,273.34	\$ 1,882.95
Total Income.....	\$160,856.29	\$154,228.34	\$ 6,627.95
Expense:			
Commission on Research and Service.....	\$ 9,710.58	\$ 9,860.10	\$ ( 158.52)
Commission on Secondary Schools.....	41,970.14	41,801.08	177.16
Commission on Colleges and Universities.....	46,926.85	44,384.46	2,542.39
Executive Committee.....	2,863.34	3,541.88	( 678.54)
Publications and Information Service.....	5,045.05	4,357.87	687.18
Advisory Committee on Programs.....	687.07	73.06	613.71
Long-Range Planning Committee.....	486.85	808.75	( 411.90)
Quarterly office.....	10,703.75	13,662.15	(2,958.40)
President's office.....	1,433.78	240.85	1,192.93
Secretary's office.....	12,480.75	11,076.39	513.36
Treasurer's office.....	4,733.21	4,426.04	306.27
General Association.....	14,113.01	12,885.03	1,227.98
Other.....	151.47	214.67	( 63.20)
Total Expenses.....	\$151,329.45	\$148,334.03	\$ 2,995.42
Net Income.....	\$ 9,526.84	\$ 5,894.31	\$ 3,632.53

## Schedule II

## NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS

R. NELSON SNIDER, TREASURER

## COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF EXPENSES FOR THE YEARS ENDED JUNE 30, 1961 AND JUNE 30, 1960

	1961			1960	Increase (Decrease)
	Budget	Spent	(Over) or Under Budget	Spent	
Commission on Research and Service:					
Steering Committee.....	\$ 1,075.00	\$ 952.30	\$ 122.70	\$ 924.09	\$ 28.21
Special Research Projects.....	400.00	—	400.00	—	—
Experimental Units Committee.....	750.00	—	750.00	599.81	( 599.81)
Teacher Education Committee:					
Directing Committee.....	750.00	222.65	527.35	463.54	( 240.89)
Council on Cooperation.....	50.00	50.00	—	50.00	—
Liberal Arts Education.....	800.00	837.95	( 37.95)	647.36	190.59
In-Service Education.....	750.00	622.76	127.24	788.26	( 165.50)
Teacher Education Institutions.....	750.00	767.18	( 17.18)	753.79	13.39
Multi-Purpose Institutions.....	750.00	660.23	89.77	534.41	125.82
Student Teaching Committee.....	750.00	640.13	109.87	562.06	78.07
Better Classroom Human Relations Committee.....	1,200.00	772.00	427.91	1,076.29	( 304.20)
McCall Study.....	200.00	200.00	—	—	200.00
Current Educational Problems Committee:					
New studies.....	100.00	5.00	95.00	4.30	.70
High school—college articulation.....	2,700.00	2,417.72	282.28	1,107.07	1,220.65
Television.....	1,000.00	568.59	431.41	1,004.05	( 435.46)
Junior college problems.....	750.00	609.01	140.99	729.64	( 120.63)
Guidance and counseling.....	750.00	384.97	365.03	534.43	( 149.46)
Total.....	\$ 13,525.00	\$ 9,710.58	\$ 3,814.42	\$ 9,860.10	\$ ( 158.52)

	1961			1960	Increase (Decrease)
	Spent	Spent	(Over) or Under Budget	Spent	
<i>Commission on Secondary Schools:</i>					
Office expense.....	\$ 850.00	\$ 850.00	\$ —	\$ 850.00	\$ —
Salary of executive secretary.....	6,000.00	6,000.00	—	5,800.00	200.00
Office secretary's salary.....	3,800.00	3,753.11	46.89	3,722.00	31.11
Extra office help.....	200.00	176.40	23.60	—	176.40
Rent.....	600.00	600.00	—	600.00	—
Telephone.....	450.00	450.00	—	450.00	—
Janitor service.....	120.00	120.00	—	120.00	—
Secretarial assistance in Chicago.....	300.00	346.84	( 46.84)	286.08	50.86
State committees.....	19,727.00	19,072.00	55.00	19,409.46	202.54
Administrative Committee.....	2,000.00	2,325.44	( 325.44)	1,671.20	654.24
Office of Chairman.....	400.00	89.75	310.25	99.72	( 9.97)
Fall meeting of state chairman.....	4,000.00	3,446.37	553.63	3,503.12	( 146.75)
Cooperating Committee on Research.....	1,000.00	30.07	469.93	1,075.43	( 545.30)
Activities Committee.....	600.00	553.25	46.75	448.81	104.44
Dependent Schools Committee.....	1,800.00	2,005.14	( 205.14)	2,172.13	( 106.00)
Report Forms Committee.....	600.00	478.30	121.70	606.00	( 128.30)
Committee on Election and Voting Procedures.....	—	—	—	154.95	( 154.95)
Relations with Colleges Committee.....	750.00	582.47	167.53	681.49	( 99.02)
Total.....	\$ 43,197.00	\$ 41,979.14	\$ 1,217.86	\$ 41,801.98	\$ 177.16
<i>Commission on Colleges and Universities:</i>					
Secretary's salary.....	\$ 2,500.00	\$ 2,499.96	.04	\$ 2,499.96	\$ —
Retirement annuities.....	2,000.00	1,982.94	17.06	1,445.28	537.66
Assistant secretaries' salaries.....	9,000.00	9,022.50	( 22.50)	14,249.38	( 5,226.88)
Clerical and stenographic salaries.....	11,400.00	9,999.96	1,400.04	7,500.00	2,499.96
Associate secretary's salary.....	9,000.00	9,954.30	( 954.30)	6,500.08	3,454.22
Student Assistant salary.....	3,000.00	—	3,000.00	—	—
Travel.....	250.00	110.76	139.24	247.39	( 136.63)
Office expense.....	3,500.00	6,913.47	( 3,413.47)	3,500.00	3,413.47
N.C.R.A.A. dues and travel.....	150.00	100.00	50.00	100.00	—
Executive Board and Commission meetings.....	4,000.00	3,546.67	453.33	3,688.74	( 442.07)
District committees.....	500.00	294.75	205.25	253.00	41.75
Revisitation project.....	2,500.00	2,351.62	148.38	2,000.00	351.62
The role of the librarian in the instructional process.....	1,000.00	—	1,000.00	769.33	( 769.33)
The Reporter.....	600.00	—	600.00	584.46	( 584.46)
Examiner's Workshop Committee.....	—	—	—	475.30	( 475.30)
Program Extension Committee.....	—	—	—	271.48	( 271.48)
Graduate Degrees Committee.....	500.00	149.92	350.08	—	149.92
Total.....	\$ 49,900.00	\$ 46,926.85	\$ 2,973.15	\$ 44,384.46	\$ 2,542.39
<i>Special Committees:</i>					
Executive Committee.....	\$ 4,625.00	\$ 2,863.34	\$ 1,761.66	\$ 3,541.88	\$ ( 678.54)
Publications and Information Service.....	5,000.00	5,045.05	( 45.05)	4,357.87	687.18
Advisory Committee on Programs.....	500.00	687.67	( 187.67)	73.96	613.71
Long-Range Planning.....	900.00	486.85	413.15	898.75	( 411.00)
Total.....	\$ 11,025.00	\$ 9,082.91	\$ 1,942.09	\$ 8,872.46	\$ 2,102.54
<i>Quarterly Office:</i>					
Office secretary's salary.....	\$ 4,300.00	\$ 1,626.33	\$ 2,673.67	\$ 4,300.00	\$ (2,673.67)
Office expense.....	300.00	300.00	—	175.46	124.54
Quarterly issues—printing.....	9,000.00	8,777.42	222.58	9,186.69	( 409.27)
Total.....	\$ 13,600.00	\$ 10,703.75	\$ 2,896.25	\$ 13,662.15	\$ (2,958.40)
<i>President's Office—Office Expense:</i>					
Secretary's Office:					
Office secretary's salary.....	\$ 5,400.00	\$ 4,400.00	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 4,700.00	\$ ( 300.00)
Secretary's salary.....	7,000.00	7,624.97	( 624.97)	7,000.00	624.97
Annual meeting expense.....	200.00	64.78	135.22	108.55	( 43.77)
Office expense.....	400.00	400.00	—	167.84	232.16
Total.....	\$ 13,000.00	\$ 12,489.75	\$ 510.25	\$ 11,976.39	\$ 513.36
<i>Treasurer's Office:</i>					
Office secretary's salary.....	\$ 3,700.00	\$ 3,700.00	\$ —	\$ 3,500.00	\$ 200.00
Office expense.....	1,350.00	1,033.21	316.79	926.94	106.27
Total.....	\$ 5,050.00	\$ 4,733.21	\$ 316.79	\$ 4,426.94	\$ 306.27
<i>General Association:</i>					
Travel.....	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 1,244.43	\$ 255.57	\$ 1,478.63	\$ ( 234.20)
Printing.....	4,500.00	4,759.01	( 259.01)	4,397.60	361.32
Annual meeting expense and speakers.....	5,500.00	6,769.22	( 1,269.22)	5,710.50	1,058.72
Contingency.....	275.00	200.00	75.00	250.62	( 50.62)
Social security.....	1,125.00	1,102.09	22.91	937.59	164.50
Past presidents breakfast.....	50.00	43.26	6.74	110.00	( 66.74)
Total.....	\$ 12,950.00	\$ 14,118.01	\$ (1,168.01)	\$ 12,885.03	\$ 1,232.98
<i>Other Expenses:</i>					
Royalties paid.....	\$ 130.07	\$ 130.07	\$ —	\$ 176.72	\$ ( 46.65)
Bank service charge.....	21.40	21.40	—	37.95	( 16.55)
Total.....	\$ 151.47	\$ 151.47	\$ —	\$ 214.67	\$ ( 63.20)
Total Expenses.....	\$163,898.47	\$151,329.45	\$12,569.02	\$148,334.03	\$ 2,995.42

# Publications of the North Central Association

Unless otherwise indicated, address communications to the Secretary, North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, University of Chicago, 5835 Kimbark, Chicago 37, Illinois.

- I. THE NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION QUARTERLY, Editorial Office, 5454 South Shore Drive, Chicago 15, Illinois.
- II. Publications produced or sponsored by Committees or Subcommittees of the Commission on Research and Service.
  - A. Unit Studies in American Problems—a new and challenging type of classroom text materials sponsored by the Committee on Experimental Units for the use of students in high school social studies classes. Charles E. Merrill Company, 400 S. Front Street, Columbus 15, Ohio.
    1. *Atomic Energy*, by WILL R. BURNETT
    2. *Conservation of Natural Resources*, by E. E. LORY and C. L. RHYNE
    3. *Housing in the United States*, by A. W. TROELSTRUP
    4. *Maps and Facts for World Understanding*
    5. *Why Taxes?* by EDWARD A. KRUG and ROBERT S. HARNACK
    6. *The Federal Government and You*
    7. *Youth and Jobs*, by DOUGLAS S. WARD
    8. *The Family and You*, by HENRY A. BOWMAN
  - B. Foreign Relations Series sponsored by the Committee on Experimental Units, available through North Central Association Foreign Relations Project, Suite 832, First National Bank Building, Chicago 3, Illinois.  
(All booklets are 75¢ each; booklets in quantities of 20 or more are 60¢ each.)
    1. The United States and World Affairs
    2. Chinese Dilemma
    3. America's Role in the Middle East
    4. America's Stake in Western Europe
    5. Southeast Asia and American Policy
    6. The United States and the Soviet Challenge
    7. Africa and the World Today
    8. The United States in the United Nations

Teachers Guides (25¢ each):

    1. Guide to The United States and World Affairs
    2. Guide to Chinese Dilemma
    3. Guide to America's Role in the Middle East
    4. Guide to America's Stake in Western Europe
    5. Guide to Southeast Asia and American Policy
    6. Guide to The United States and the Soviet Challenge
    7. Guide to Africa and the World Today
    8. Guide to The United States in the United Nations

Classroom Tips (10¢ each):

    1. May, 1959—Survey of U. S. Military Establishment
    2. October, 1959—The Challenge in Southeast Asia
    3. March, 1960—Europe—At Sixes and Sevens?
    4. January, 1961—Gold—Problems and Prospects

(All prices are plus transportation, shipped F.O.B. Chicago. On cash orders, add 5% for postage and handling.)
  - C. Publications developed and issued by the NCA Project on Guidance and Motivation of Superior and Talented Students (STS Project), 5454 South Shore Drive, Chicago 15, Illinois.
    1. *Action Program of the STS Project* (July 22, 1959).
    2. *Research Design of the STS Project* (a mimeographed booklet issued on July 22, 1959).
    3. *A Prospectus* (25¢ for single copy; 15¢ for five or more copies).
    4. *Workshop Procedures* (25¢ for single copy; 15¢ for five or more copies).
    5. *Identification* (25¢ for single copy; 15¢ for five or more copies).
    6. *Cues to Successful Study* (10¢ each).
    7. *Problems in Motivation* (10¢ each).
    8. *A Selected and Annotated Bibliography*.
    9. "Articulation: A Need and a Promise Half Fulfilled" by Stephen Romine.
    10. *News, Notes and Nuggets*, a monthly newsletter of the Project. Special Edition, November, 1960, "The School Provides for Superior Students" (50¢ for single copy; 40¢ for ten or more copies).



11. *Do Your Dreams Match Your Talents?* by Vance Packard. Published and distributed by Science Research Associates, 259 East Erie Street, Chicago 11, Illinois (\$5.50)
  12. *Working With Superior Students: Theories and Practices*, edited by Bruce Shertzer. Published and distributed by Science Research Associates, 259 East Erie Street, Chicago 11, Illinois (\$5.95).
  13. *Guidelines for Parents of Capable Youth* by Robert F. DeHaan. Published and Distributed by Science Research Associates, 259 East Erie Street, Chicago 11, Illinois. (50¢ for single copy; 45¢ for 20-99 copies; 40¢ for 100 or more copies. Order No. S-44.)
  14. *Guiding Superior and Talented High School Students* by Frank S. Endicott. (\$1.00 per copy)
  15. *A Selected Resume of Literature on the Superior and Talented Student* by June Sochen. (\$.50 per copy)
- D. Pamphlets produced as outgrowths of committee studies and projects.
1. Better Colleges, Better Teachers—Macmillan Company, 60 Fifth Avenue, New York 11, New York.
  2. Incentives Used in Motivating Professional Growth of Teachers (single copies 25¢; quantities of 10 or more 15¢ each).
  3. The Workshop as an In-Service Education Procedure (single copies 25¢; quantities of 10 or more 15¢ each).
  4. Improvement of Reading in Colleges and Secondary Schools.
  5. Better Education for Nonacademic Pupils (single copies 25¢; quantities of ten or more, 15¢ each).
  6. Some Guiding Principles for Student Teaching Programs.
  7. Appraisal of the Current Status of Television as a Medium of Instruction—National Educational Television and Radio Center, 10 Columbus Circle, 1590 Coliseum Building, New York 19, New York.
  8. The Uses of Television in Education.
  9. First Report on External Testing, *NCA Today*, December, 1960, Special Issue.
  10. Second Report on External Testing, *NCA Today*, August, 1961, Special Issue.
  11. *Pros and Cons of External Testing* by Frank Womer (25¢ each copy).
  12. Two Studies on In-Service Education of College Instructors (single copies 25¢; quantities of ten or more, 15¢ each).
- E. *Syllabus—Functional Health Training*, by LYNDIA M. WEBER. Published and distributed by Ginn and Company, Chicago.
- F. *Improving Teacher Education Through Inter-College Cooperation*—Wm C. Brown, Co., 215 West Ninth, Dubuque, Iowa (\$3.50).
- III. Publications of the Commission on Secondary Schools, distributed free to members of the Commission and member schools. Available from Executive Secretary, Commission on Secondary Schools, North Central Association, 1904 East Washington St., Charleston 1, West Virginia.
- A. *Policies, Regulations, and Criteria for the Approval of Secondary Schools*
  - B. *Handbook for State Chairmen and Reviewing Committees*
  - C. *Know Your North Central Association*
- IV. Publications available from the Office of the Secretary, Commission on Colleges and Universities, North Central Association, 5454 So. Shore Drive, Chicago 15, Ill.
- A. Annual list of institutions of higher education accredited by the Commission on Colleges and Universities.
  - B. National list of institutions of higher education accredited by the six regional accrediting agencies, published by the National Committee of Regional Accrediting Agencies of the United States.
- V. Publications jointly sponsored by the North Central Association and other educational organizations or agencies.
- A. *Your Life Plans and the Armed Forces*. 160 pages, 8½×11. Paper, \$1.25; *Teachers Handbook*, 8½×11. Paper. 32 pages, \$0.60. Order from the National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington 25, D. C.
  - B. *A Guide to the Evaluation of Educational Experiences in the Armed Services*, 1954 Revision: Formal Service Courses in Schools. Published in cooperation with the American Council on Education and eighteen other accrediting and standardizing educational associations. Order from the American Council on Education, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue, Washington 6, D. C. \$5.00.
  - C. Publications of National Study of Secondary School Evaluation. Available from 1785 Massachusetts Avenue, Washington 6, D. C.
    1. *Evaluative Criteria* (1960 Edition), cloth \$5.00; paper. \$4.00.
- VI. *A History of the North Central Association*, by CALVIN O. DAVIS, 1945. Pp. xvii+286, \$2.00 plus postage. Available from Editorial Office of THE NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION QUARTERLY, 5454 South Shore Drive, Chicago 15, Illinois.
- VII. *NCA Today*, Editorial Office, 5454 South Shore Drive, Chicago 15, Illinois.







# Officers of the Association

## Executive Committee

THE PRESIDENT,  
VICE-PRESIDENT,  
SECRETARY, AND  
TREASURER  
*Ex Officio*

*President:* J. FRED MURPHY, Principal, Broad Ripple High School, Indianapolis 20, Indiana  
*Vice President:* IRWIN LUBBERS, President, Hope College, Holland, Michigan  
*Secretary:* NORMAN BURNS, Professor of Education, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois  
*Treasurer:* R. NELSON SNIDER, Principal, South Side High School, Fort Wayne, Indiana

KENNETH E. ANDERSON, Dean, College of Education, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas (1965)  
WILLIAM N. ATKINSON, President, Jackson Junior College, Jackson, Michigan (1964)  
IRA L. BALDWIN, Special Assistant to the President, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin (1965)  
WAYNE C. BLOUGH, Principal, Shaw High School, East Cleveland, Ohio  
ELMER ELLIS, President, University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri (1963)  
DONALD G. EMERY, Superintendent of Schools, Shaker Heights, Ohio (1965)  
ALVA J. GIBSON, 1904 E. Washington Street, Charleston 1, West Virginia  
LAWRENCE W. HANSON, Principal, Central High School, Grand Forks, North Dakota (1963)  
MARVIN C. KNUDSON, President, Pueblo Junior College, Pueblo, Colorado  
SIMEON E. LELAND, Dean, College of Liberal Arts, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois (1964)  
STEPHEN A. ROMINE, Dean, School of Education, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado  
HERBERT W. SCHOOLING, Superintendent of Schools, Webster Groves, Missouri  
CLYDE VROMAN, Director of Admissions, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan  
H. PAT WARDLAW, Assistant Commissioner, State Department of Education, Jefferson City, Missouri (1964)

## Chairmen of the Commissions

*Secondary Schools:* WAYNE C. BLOUGH, Principal, Shaw High School, East Cleveland, Ohio  
*Colleges and Universities:* MARVIN C. KNUDSON, President, Pueblo Junior College, Pueblo, Colorado  
*Research and Service:* CLYDE VROMAN, Director of Admissions, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan

## Vice Chairmen of the Commissions

*Secondary Schools:* L. A. VAN DYKE, Professor of Education, University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa  
*Colleges and Universities:* EDWARD J. DRUMMOND, S. J., Vice President for Academic Affairs, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin  
*Research and Service:* FRANK S. ENDICOTT, Director of Placement, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois

## Secretaries of the Commissions

*Secondary Schools:* A. J. GIBSON, State Department of Education, Charleston 1, West Virginia  
*Colleges and Universities:* NORMAN BURNS, Professor of Education, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois  
*Research and Service:* HERBERT W. SCHOOLING, Superintendent of Schools, Webster Groves, Missouri

## Secretaries of the Association

*Executive Secretary:* Norman Burns, 5454 South Shore Drive, Chicago 15, Illinois  
*Associate Secretary:* Anne Stameshkin, 5454 South Shore Drive, Chicago 15, Illinois

